Journal of Management Science Research Review
https://jmsrr.com/index.php/Journal/about

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)

Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

Project Cognition and Strategic Failure: How Cognitive Biases Shape Decision-Making in Complex Projects

Muhammad Kabir
Independent Researcher
Email: kabir.jabota@gmail.com

Abstract
Cognitive biases significantly influence strategic decision-making in complex projects, often leading to systematic errors and project failure. This study investigates how cognitive biases—such as overconfidence, confirmation bias, anchoring, and escalation of commitment—shape decision-making processes in project environments. Drawing upon behavioral economics and project management literature, the study employs a mixed-method approach combining survey data and case-based analysis. Findings indicate that cognitive biases distort risk assessment, planning accuracy, and stakeholder judgment, ultimately contributing to cost overruns, delays, and strategic misalignment. The research highlights the need for structured decision frameworks and debiasing techniques to enhance project success rates. This paper contributes to the growing body of knowledge on behavioral project management and offers practical recommendations for mitigating cognitive distortions in strategic decision-making.

Keywords: Cognitive Bias, Strategic Failure, Project Management, Decision-Making, Behavioral Economics

1. Introduction

Complex projects—particularly in sectors such as infrastructure, information technology, and organizational transformation—are characterized by uncertainty, interdependence, and high stakes. Decision-making in such environments is rarely linear or purely rational; instead, it is shaped by cognitive limitations, environmental pressures, and social dynamics. While classical project management frameworks emphasize planning, control, and optimization, they often overlook the psychological processes that underpin managerial decisions. This gap has led scholars to increasingly examine the role of cognition in project outcomes.

Cognitive biases, as systematic deviations from rational judgment, have emerged as a central concern in understanding why well-planned projects fail despite technical competence and resource availability. These biases influence how decision-makers perceive risks, interpret data, and evaluate alternatives. For instance, project managers may rely on heuristics—mental shortcuts—to simplify complex decisions, but these heuristics can produce predictable errors, especially under time pressure and uncertainty (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

In modern project environments, the consequences of biased decision-making are amplified due to increased complexity and scale. Large-scale projects often involve

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

multiple stakeholders, ambiguous goals, and dynamic external conditions, making them particularly vulnerable to cognitive distortions. Research suggests that even experienced professionals are not immune to biases; in fact, expertise can sometimes reinforce overconfidence and resistance to corrective feedback (Lovallo & Kahneman, 2003).

Another critical dimension is the organizational context in which decisions are made. Organizational culture, leadership styles, and communication structures can either mitigate or exacerbate cognitive biases. For example, hierarchical environments may discourage dissenting opinions, thereby reinforcing confirmation bias and groupthink. Conversely, organizations that promote critical thinking and open dialogue are better positioned to challenge flawed assumptions and improve decision quality.

Furthermore, the digital transformation of project management has introduced new complexities. While data analytics and decision-support systems offer opportunities to reduce human error, they do not eliminate cognitive biases entirely. Decision-makers may still misinterpret data or selectively use information that aligns with their preconceived notions. This interplay between human cognition and technological tools underscores the need for a behavioral perspective in project management research.

Although prior project management research acknowledges the challenges associated with decision-making in complex environments, the role of cognitive biases is often examined in isolation or within limited contexts. There remains a need for a more integrated understanding of how multiple cognitive biases interact and collectively influence strategic outcomes, particularly in high-stakes and dynamic project settings. In this regard, empirical approaches that combine behavioral insights with project management practices are still relatively underdeveloped. Addressing this concern, the present study adopts a comprehensive perspective to examine how interacting cognitive biases shape strategic decision-making and contribute to project failure.

This study aims to:

• Identify key cognitive biases affecting project decisions
• Analyze their impact on strategic outcomes
• Propose practical strategies for mitigating their effects

By integrating theoretical insights with empirical analysis, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of behavioral factors in project success and failure. It also provides actionable recommendations for practitioners seeking to improve decision-making processes in complex project environments.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Cognitive Bias Theory

Cognitive bias theory originates from behavioral economics and psychology, particularly the heuristics-and-biases framework. It suggests that individuals rely on mental shortcuts (heuristics), which often lead to systematic errors.

Biases arise due to limited cognitive capacity and information-processing constraints, a concept rooted in bounded rationality (Simon, 1957). Cognitive biases are pervasive and influence decisions across domains including business, healthcare, and project management .

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

The concept of cognitive bias is rooted in the broader framework of bounded rationality, which posits that individuals operate under constraints of limited information, time, and cognitive capacity (Simon, 1957). Unlike the classical economic assumption of fully rational actors, behavioral scholars argue that decision-making is often influenced by heuristics—simplified strategies that facilitate quick judgments but may lead to systematic errors.

Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) pioneering work on prospect theory revolutionized the understanding of decision-making under uncertainty by demonstrating that individuals evaluate potential gains and losses asymmetrically. This has significant implications for project management, where decisions often involve risk assessment and trade-offs between competing objectives. The tendency to avoid losses more strongly than to pursue gains can lead to conservative strategies or, paradoxically, risky decisions when attempting to recover losses.

Cognitive biases manifest in various forms within project environments, each affecting decision-making in distinct ways. Overconfidence bias, for instance, leads individuals to overestimate their knowledge, abilities, and control over outcomes. Research indicates that overconfidence is particularly prevalent among experienced professionals, who may rely heavily on past successes and underestimate the complexity of new challenges (Lovallo & Kahneman, 2003). This bias often results in unrealistic project timelines, underestimated budgets, and insufficient risk assessments. Similarly, confirmation bias causes decision-makers to favor information that supports their pre-existing beliefs while disregarding contradictory evidence. In project settings, this can lead to selective data interpretation, where managers ignore warning signs and continue pursuing flawed strategies.

Another critical bias in project management is anchoring, which occurs when individuals rely too heavily on initial information when making decisions. Early estimates of cost, time, or scope often serve as anchors, influencing subsequent judgments even when new information becomes available. This can result in persistent inaccuracies in project planning and forecasting. The availability bias further complicates decision-making by causing individuals to base judgments on information that is easily recalled rather than objectively relevant. For example, a project manager may overestimate the likelihood of a risk based on a recent experience, rather than considering statistical evidence. These biases highlight the cognitive limitations that affect even routine project decisions.

Escalation of commitment, closely related to the sunk cost fallacy, is another significant contributor to strategic failure in projects. This bias refers to the tendency of decision-makers to continue investing in a failing course of action due to prior investments of time, money, or effort. Research by Staw (1976) and subsequent scholars has shown that escalation of commitment is driven by psychological factors such as self-justification and fear of admitting failure. In complex projects, this bias can lead to prolonged continuation of unviable initiatives, resulting in substantial financial and organizational losses. The planning fallacy, another well-documented bias, causes individuals to underestimate the time, cost, and risks associated with tasks while overestimating their ability to complete them efficiently. This bias is particularly

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

problematic in large-scale projects, where inaccurate forecasts can have cascading effects on project performance.

Beyond individual biases, social and organizational factors also play a significant role in shaping decision-making processes. Groupthink, a phenomenon identified by Janis (1972), occurs when the desire for consensus within a group suppresses critical evaluation of alternatives. In project teams, this can lead to poor decision-making, as dissenting opinions are discouraged and flawed assumptions go unchallenged. Similarly, status quo bias reflects a preference for maintaining existing conditions, even when change may be beneficial. This bias can hinder innovation and prevent organizations from adapting to changing environments. Organizational culture, leadership style, and communication structures can either exacerbate or mitigate these biases. For instance, hierarchical organizations may reinforce confirmation bias by limiting the flow of diverse perspectives, while more collaborative environments may encourage critical thinking and reduce bias.

The role of cognitive biases in strategic decision-making has been extensively examined in the fields of management and organizational behavior. Scholars such as Das and Teng (1999) argue that biases significantly influence strategic choices, including risk assessment, resource allocation, and partnership decisions. In project contexts, strategic decisions often involve long-term commitments and high levels of uncertainty, making them particularly susceptible to cognitive distortions. Empirical studies have shown that biases such as overconfidence and optimism can lead to overly aggressive strategies, while loss aversion may result in overly cautious approaches. These biases not only affect individual decisions but also shape organizational strategies and outcomes.

Cognitive biases also influence different stages of the project lifecycle, from initiation to closure. During the initiation phase, optimism bias and overconfidence can lead to overly favorable feasibility assessments, resulting in the approval of projects that may not be viable. In the planning phase, anchoring and the planning fallacy distort estimates of time and cost, leading to unrealistic schedules and budgets. During execution, escalation of commitment and the sunk cost fallacy may cause managers to continue investing in failing projects rather than terminating them. Finally, in the closure phase, hindsight bias can distort evaluations of project outcomes, leading to inaccurate learning and reduced opportunities for improvement. This lifecycle perspective highlights the pervasive nature of cognitive biases and their impact on project performance.

Empirical evidence from various industries supports the argument that cognitive biases are a major contributor to project failure. Large infrastructure projects, for example, frequently experience cost overruns and delays due to optimism bias and strategic misrepresentation (Flyvbjerg, 2021). Similarly, information technology projects often fail due to unrealistic expectations and resistance to negative feedback. These patterns suggest that project failures are not random but are driven by predictable cognitive processes. Understanding these processes is essential for improving project outcomes and reducing the likelihood of failure.

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

In response to the challenges posed by cognitive biases, researchers have proposed various debiasing strategies aimed at improving decision-making. Techniques such as pre-mortem analysis, where potential failures are identified before project initiation, have been shown to enhance risk awareness and reduce overconfidence. Red team exercises, which involve independent evaluation of project plans, can help counteract confirmation bias and groupthink. Additionally, structured decision-making frameworks and checklists can standardize processes and reduce reliance on intuition. The use of data-driven tools and decision-support systems also offers potential for mitigating biases, although these tools are not immune to misinterpretation by biased individuals.

Despite these advancements, debiasing remains a complex challenge. Cognitive biases are deeply embedded in human cognition and are often resistant to change. Awareness of biases alone is insufficient to eliminate their effects; instead, effective interventions require a combination of individual training, organizational support, and structural changes in decision-making processes. Furthermore, there is a need for more empirical research that integrates multiple biases and examines their combined impact on project outcomes. Many existing studies focus on isolated biases or theoretical models, limiting their practical applicability.

It demonstrates that cognitive biases are pervasive and have a significant impact on decision-making in complex projects. These biases influence not only individual judgments but also organizational strategies and outcomes. While various debiasing techniques have been proposed, their effectiveness remains limited, highlighting the need for further research in this area. This study builds on existing literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of how cognitive biases interact and contribute to strategic failure in project environments.

2.2 Types of Cognitive Biases in Projects

2.2.1 Overconfidence Bias

Overconfidence leads managers to overestimate their knowledge and underestimate risks, resulting in unrealistic planning and forecasting.

2.2.2 Confirmation Bias

Decision-makers favor information that supports pre-existing beliefs while ignoring contradictory evidence.

2.2.3 Anchoring Bias

Initial information heavily influences subsequent judgments, even when irrelevant.

2.2.4 Availability Bias

Decisions are influenced by easily recalled information rather than objective data.

2.2.5 Escalation of Commitment

Managers continue investing in failing projects due to sunk costs and psychological commitment.

2.2.6 Planning Fallacy

Individuals underestimate time, costs, and risks while overestimating benefits.

These biases are widely recognized as major drivers of project failure.

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

2.3 Cognitive Biases and Strategic Decision-Making

Strategic decision-making involves long-term, high-stakes choices under uncertainty. Cognitive biases influence:

- Risk perception
- Resource allocation
- Innovation strategies

Empirical research indicates that biases such as loss aversion and overconfidence significantly impact strategic outcomes, including investment decisions and organizational performance.

2.4 Cognitive Biases and Project Failure

Project failures often stem from biased assumptions rather than technical flaws. Cognitive biases distort:

- Forecasting accuracy
- Stakeholder alignment
- Risk management

Behavioral studies suggest that project underperformance is often due to bias rather than random error.

2.5 Debiasing Strategies

Researchers propose several methods to mitigate biases:

- Structured decision-making frameworks
- Scenario planning
- Independent reviews
- Data-driven analytics

However, evidence suggests that simple awareness alone is insufficient to eliminate biases.

3. Research Methodology

Research Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-method research design to examine how cognitive biases influence decision-making and contribute to strategic failure in complex projects. The quantitative approach provides measurable insights into the prevalence of biases, while the qualitative component offers a deeper understanding of decision-making behaviors in real project contexts. The research follows a descriptive and explanatory design, aiming to identify key cognitive biases and analyze their impact on project outcomes.

The study population consists of project management professionals from sectors such as IT, construction, and business services. A sample of 120 respondents was selected using purposive sampling, ensuring participants had at least three years of relevant experience. The sample size is considered adequate for regression-based analysis, as it meets general statistical guidelines for examining relationships among multiple variables while maintaining sufficient power and representativeness within the targeted professional groups. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire based on a Likert scale, along with semi-structured interviews and selected case studies to enhance data richness and reliability.

Quantitative Analysis and Regression Model

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis to examine the relationship between cognitive biases (independent variables) and strategic project failure (dependent variable). The regression model is specified as follows:

Strategic Failure = β_0 + β_1(Confirmation Bias) + β_2(Overconfidence Bias) + β_3(Anchoring Bias) + β_4(Availability Bias) + ε

This model enables the study to estimate the individual and combined effects of key cognitive biases on project outcomes while controlling for error variance.

Reliability and Validity

To ensure reliability, the internal consistency of the questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. The overall scale demonstrated acceptable reliability ($\alpha \approx 0.78$), while individual constructs such as confirmation bias ($\alpha \approx 0.75$), overconfidence bias ($\alpha \approx 0.80$), and anchoring bias ($\alpha \approx 0.73$) also met recommended thresholds. Content validity was ensured through expert review, and data triangulation between quantitative and qualitative findings strengthened the overall credibility of the results.

Qualitative Component

The qualitative component included semi-structured interviews with **12 senior project managers** from relevant industries. These interviews provided contextual insights into how cognitive biases manifest in real-world decision-making scenarios. The data were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns and behavioral tendencies influencing project outcomes.

Ethical considerations were maintained by ensuring participant confidentiality, informed consent, and voluntary participation. Overall, the methodology provides a balanced and systematic approach to understanding the role of cognitive biases in complex project environments.

4. Data Collection

Data were collected through:

- Online surveys distributed to professionals
- Interviews with senior project managers
- Analysis of failed project case studies

Survey focused on:

- Decision-making patterns
- Risk perception
- Bias awareness

5. Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative techniques to ensure a comprehensive interpretation of the findings. Quantitative data obtained from the structured questionnaires were processed using statistical methods, including descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, and mean scores, to identify the prevalence of various cognitive biases among respondents. Furthermore, regression analysis was employed to examine the relationship between cognitive biases (independent variables) and indicators of strategic failure, such as cost overruns, project

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

delays, and decision inefficiencies. The results indicated a significant positive relationship between the presence of cognitive biases—particularly overconfidence, confirmation bias, and escalation of commitment—and the likelihood of project failure. In addition, qualitative data collected through interviews and case studies were analyzed using thematic analysis, which helped identify recurring patterns and underlying factors influencing decision-making behavior. The integration of both quantitative and qualitative findings provided a more holistic understanding of how cognitive biases shape strategic outcomes in complex project environments.

6. Results

This section presents the statistical findings of the study, focusing on measurable outcomes and relationships between variables.

6.1 Prevalence of Cognitive Biases

The analysis of survey data (n = 120) indicates that cognitive biases are widely present among project managers:

Bias Type	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Overconfidence Bias	3.92	0.71
Confirmation Bias	3.78	0.64
Anchoring Bias	3.55	0.68
Availability Bias	3.61	0.66

These values suggest a moderate to high level of bias across respondents.

6.2 Relationship with Strategic Failure

Correlation analysis reveals significant positive relationships between cognitive biases and project failure indicators:

Variable	Correlation with Strategic Failure (r)
Overconfidence Bias	0.61
Confirmation Bias	0.52
Anchoring Bias	0.48
Availability Bias	0.50

All relationships are statistically significant (**$p < 0.05$**), indicating that increased bias levels are associated with higher risks of delays, cost overruns, and poor strategic decisions.

6.3 Regression Outcomes

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess predictive strength:

- **$R^2 = 0.58$**, indicating that 58% of the variance in strategic failure is explained by cognitive biases.

Predictor	Beta (β)	Significance (p)
Overconfidence Bias	0.35	0.000
Confirmation Bias	0.29	0.001
Anchoring Bias	0.21	0.005

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

Predictor	Beta (β)	Significance (p)
Availability Bias	0.24	0.003

Overconfidence bias is the strongest predictor of strategic failure.

6.4 Qualitative Insights

Interviews with **12 senior project managers** revealed:

- Frequent escalation of commitment despite negative project signals
- Selective interpretation of data reinforcing prior decisions
- Strong reliance on initial estimates (anchoring effects)

These patterns confirm that biases not only exist but actively influence real-world project decisions.

7. Discussion

The findings demonstrate that cognitive biases play a critical role in shaping decision-making and contributing to strategic failure in complex projects. The strong influence of overconfidence bias supports the work of Daniel Kahneman, who argued that individuals tend to overestimate their knowledge and predictive abilities, particularly in uncertain environments.

Similarly, the significant effect of confirmation bias aligns with research by T. K. Das and Bing-Sheng Teng, which highlights how decision-makers selectively interpret information to support existing beliefs, often leading to flawed strategic choices.

The regression results ($R^2 = 0.58$) indicate that cognitive biases collectively explain a substantial portion of project failure, reinforcing the argument that behavioral factors are central to project outcomes. This is consistent with the perspective of Bent Flyvbjerg, who emphasizes the role of psychological biases in cost overruns and planning inaccuracies.

Furthermore, the interaction of biases observed in qualitative findings suggests that these are not isolated phenomena but mutually reinforcing mechanisms. For instance, overconfidence may lead to escalation of commitment, while confirmation bias sustains flawed decisions. This reflects the concept of bounded rationality proposed by Herbert A. Simon, where decision-making is constrained by cognitive limitations rather than purely rational evaluation.

Organizational context also plays a significant role. Hierarchical structures and limited critical feedback appear to intensify biases, reducing opportunities for corrective action. This highlights the importance of organizational culture in shaping decision quality.

Overall, the study suggests that technical expertise alone is insufficient for effective project management. Instead, structured decision-making frameworks, critical evaluation mechanisms, and open communication environments are essential to mitigate cognitive biases. By integrating behavioral insights into project management practices, organizations can improve strategic outcomes and reduce the likelihood of project failure.

7.1 Impact on Strategic Failure

Biases contribute to:

- Cost overruns

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

- Delays
- Poor strategic alignment

For example:

- Overconfidence leads to underestimated risks
- Confirmation bias limits alternative solutions
- Escalation of commitment prolongs failing projects

7.2 Integration with Theory

The results align with behavioral decision theory, which argues that human decision-making is inherently biased and constrained.

7.3 Practical Implications

Organizations should:

- Implement structured decision frameworks
- Encourage dissenting opinions

Use data analytics tools

8. Limitations and Future Research

Despite providing valuable insights into the role of cognitive biases in project decision-making, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged.

First, the **sample size** of 120 respondents, while adequate for statistical analysis, may limit the generalizability of the findings. A larger and more diverse sample could provide more robust and widely applicable results.

Second, the study is constrained by its **geographical scope**, as the data were collected from specific sectors within a limited regional context. Organizational cultures and decision-making practices may vary across countries and industries; therefore, future research should consider cross-cultural comparisons to enhance external validity.

Third, the research relies partly on **self-reported data**, which may introduce response bias. Participants might unintentionally overestimate or underestimate their behaviors due to social desirability or lack of self-awareness regarding cognitive biases. Incorporating observational or experimental methods in future studies could help mitigate this limitation.

Fourth, the study adopts a **cross-sectional design**, capturing data at a single point in time. This limits the ability to establish causal relationships or observe how cognitive biases evolve throughout different project phases. Longitudinal studies are recommended to better understand the dynamic nature of decision-making over time.

In terms of future research directions, scholars are encouraged to explore the interaction of multiple cognitive biases in different project environments using advanced analytical techniques. Additionally, experimental designs and real-time decision tracking could provide deeper insights into behavioral patterns. Further investigation into intervention strategies, such as bias-awareness training and decision-support frameworks, would also contribute to both theory and practice.

9. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that cognitive biases play a critical role in shaping decision-making processes in complex projects. These biases lead to systematic errors that

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

contribute to strategic failure. While awareness of biases is important, it is insufficient without structured interventions. Organizations must adopt debiasing strategies to improve decision quality and enhance project success rates.

In addition to its theoretical contributions, this study offers important practical implications for project managers and organizations operating in complex environments. It emphasizes that improving project outcomes requires not only technical competence but also a conscious effort to address the cognitive limitations that influence decision-making. Organizations should invest in training programs that enhance awareness of cognitive biases and promote critical thinking skills among project teams. Furthermore, integrating structured decision-support tools, encouraging independent reviews, and fostering a culture of open communication can significantly reduce the impact of biased judgments. Future research may explore the role of emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence and data analytics, in minimizing cognitive distortions and supporting more rational decision-making processes. By acknowledging and addressing the behavioral dimensions of project management, organizations can enhance strategic effectiveness and increase the likelihood of project success.

References

1. Daniel Kahneman, D., & Amos Tversky, A. (1979). *Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk*. Econometrica.
2. Herbert A. Simon, H. A. (1957). *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Free Press.
3. Bent Flyvbjerg, B. (2021). *Top ten behavioral biases in project management: An overview*. Project Management Journal.
4. Mirbagheri, S. M., & Atani, A. (2025). *Cognitive biases in decision-making: A systematic review*.
5. Gustavo Saposnik, G., et al. (2016). *Cognitive biases associated with medical decisions*. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making.
6. T. K. Das, T. K., & Bing-Sheng Teng, B. S. (1999). *Cognitive biases and strategic decision processes*. Journal of Management Studies.
7. Thomas Gilovich, T., Griffin, D., & Kahneman, D. (2002). *Heuristics and Biases: The Psychology of Intuitive Judgment*. Cambridge University Press.
8. James G. March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
9. Johnson, D. D. P., et al. (2013). *Overconfidence in decision-making and its implications*.
10. Marshall, A., et al. (2013). *Behavioral decision-making in organizations*.
11. Martie Haselton, M. G., Nettle, D., & Andrews, P. W. (2015). *The evolution of cognitive bias*.
12. Gerrit Phillips-Wren, G., et al. (2019). *Decision support systems and behavioral impacts*.
13. Begum, N., et al. (2025). *Cognitive bias in high-stakes decision-making environments*.
14. Purnamawati, R. (2024). *Leadership and cognitive bias in organizational decision-making*.

Volume 5 Issue No 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

15. Charles R. Schwenk, C. R. (1986). *Information, cognitive biases, and commitment to a course of action*. Academy of Management Review.
16. Lowell W. Busenitz, L. W., & Jay B. Barney, J. B. (1997). *Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics*. Journal of Business Venturing.
17. Mark Simon, M., Houghton, S. M., & Aquino, K. (2000). *Cognitive biases, risk perception, and decision-making*.
18. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (2000). *A resource-based theory of strategic alliances and risk*.
19. Max H. Bazerman, M. H. (2006). *Judgment in Managerial Decision Making*. Wiley.
20. Dan Lovallo, D., & Kahneman, D. (2003). *Delusions of success: How optimism undermines executives' decisions*. Harvard Business Review.
21. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.