

Leadership as a Cultural Enabler of Knowledge Management in High-reliability Organisations

Małgorzata Wiśniewska

Poznan University of Technology, Poland

malgorzata.wisniewska@put.poznan.pl

Abstract: In the context of high-reliability and high-consequence organisations, knowledge management initiatives are often impeded by cultural barriers that hinder the disclosure, sharing, and utilisation of sensitive knowledge. The present paper examines how leadership shapes organisational culture conditions that determine the effectiveness of knowledge management, drawing on empirical evidence from nuclear security culture (NSC) self-assessment processes conducted in medical organisations using radioactive sources. The study conceptualises NSC self-assessment not as a compliance exercise, but as a structured knowledge management intervention aimed at eliciting tacit knowledge, weak signals, and experiential insights related to organisational vulnerabilities and human performance. The present paper builds on qualitative and mixed-method evidence from the first Polish self-assessment of nuclear security culture in a medical facility, supported by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The paper analyses how leadership behaviours influence knowledge creation, psychological safety, and the translation of assessment findings into organisational learning and change. The findings of the study indicate that leadership plays a decisive role in reducing cultural barriers to knowledge management, including fear of blame, formalism, and low trust in governance structures. The presence of visible leadership engagement, non-punitive responses to reported weaknesses, and active sense-making of assessment results have been found to significantly enhance knowledge sharing and learning outcomes. Conversely, leadership approaches that prioritise regulatory compliance have been shown to impede the practical application of knowledge derived from assessments and to diminish the efficacy of change processes. The present paper contributes to the knowledge management literature by positioning leadership as a cultural enabler of KM effectiveness in contexts where knowledge is sensitive, risk-laden, and ethically constrained. The present study extends the existing research in the fields of knowledge management (KM) and organisational culture by demonstrating how assessment-based KM initiatives can support sustainable change when embedded within leadership-driven cultural frameworks. Practical implications are offered for leaders and KM practitioners designing and governing knowledge initiatives in high-risk organisational settings.

Keywords: Knowledge management, Leadership, Organisational culture, Knowledge sharing, Organisational learning

1. Introduction

High-reliability organisations (HROs) function in environments where failures are infrequent but potentially disastrous. In such contexts, performance is contingent on the timely availability, interpretation, and utilisation of knowledge, encompassing experiential know-how, weak signals, near-miss narratives, and cross-functional expertise. While KM is often discussed in terms of repositories and systems, in HRO contexts it is equally (and sometimes primarily) a cultural and behavioural problem: whether people notice, report, and share what they know when it is uncomfortable or reputationally risky.

Healthcare organisations that utilise high-activity radioactive sources (e.g., radiotherapy, PET, nuclear medicine) represent a distinctive high-consequence, high-reliability-like setting. The technical and regulatory controls are strict, yet work is carried out through interdependent professional groups and in environments that must remain accessible to patients, visitors, and contractors. This predicament gives rise to a dual challenge: The necessity for reliable knowledge is evident across various roles and shifts. Concurrently, there exists a pronounced inclination to impede disclosure, primarily attributable to concerns regarding attribution of blame, apprehension of legal and regulatory ramifications, and the presence of hierarchical impediments.

This paper employs the concept of nuclear security culture (NSC) self-assessment as a methodological framework for the examination of knowledge management (KM) in high-stakes conditions. NSC self-assessment is conventionally conceptualised within the domain of security, serving as a mechanism for the evaluation of beliefs, behaviours, and management systems. In this paradigm, KM intervention is conceptualised as a structured approach to the capture of tacit knowledge and weak signals, with the objective of their conversion into shared interpretations, thereby facilitating organisational learning and change.

Empirically, the paper draws on the first Polish NSC self-assessment in a medical facility using radioactive sources, conducted within an IAEA-coordinated research project. The self-assessment was not regarded as an audit, but rather as a participatory diagnostic process, incorporating pilot testing, staff engagement, and follow-up sensemaking with leaders.

The central research question guiding this study is as follows: This study seeks to explore the way leadership behaviours enable or constrain the knowledge processes generated by NSC self-assessment in a high-reliability medical setting. The paper makes three key contributions. Firstly, it integrates knowledge management (KM) and security culture literatures through an assessment-based intervention model. Secondly, it provides rare empirical evidence from a security-sensitive healthcare context. Thirdly, it proposes leadership mechanisms – legitimisation, protection and translation – that explain when assessment knowledge becomes organisational learning.

Positioning of the study: This is a theory-building case study with analytic generalisation. It does not aim to statistically validate established KM constructs; instead, it refines and integrates them by specifying leadership-enabled mechanisms (legitimisation, protection and translation) that explain how assessment-based KM interventions convert sensitive knowledge into organisational learning in high-reliability settings.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Leadership as an Antecedent of Knowledge Sharing and Organisational Learning

The influence of leadership on KM outcomes is multifaceted, encompassing both direct choices, such as investments and governance, and indirect cultural shaping. This cultural shaping encompasses norms regarding openness, trust, and the acceptable expression of ideas. The KM literature has seen an increasing focus on leadership styles that emphasise knowledge behaviours, such as knowledge-oriented leadership. The extant literature suggests an association between knowledge-oriented leadership and psychological safety, as well as employee voice. These phenomena are two mechanisms through which knowledge is surfaced and used (Ononye, 2024).

In high-risk settings, the influence of leadership is amplified because knowledge is often socially costly: the disclosure of vulnerabilities can imply error, negligence, or noncompliance. Research on just culture in healthcare has demonstrated that an environment focused on blame can result in reduced reporting and learning, while leadership commitment and open communication have been shown to encourage disclosure and facilitate improvement (Kumah, 2025; Badran, 2026). Even though these studies are not framed as KM research, they map directly to KM constructs such as knowledge sharing, feedback loops and learning from incidents.

Beyond formal structures, intangible human factors have the capacity to either activate or suppress knowledge processes. Recent ECKM research connects emotional intelligence and other intangible capabilities to knowledge activation in human–AI collaboration, reinforcing the wider KM point that 'soft' factors shape whether knowledge is shared and used (Tsakalerou et al., 2025b).

The impact of leadership on sensemaking within organisations is a significant area of interest. Leaders play a pivotal role in shaping how organisational members interpret events and signals. This influence determines whether signals are regarded as meaningful evidence or disregarded as irrelevant noise. In practice, leaders can institutionalise sensemaking through structured debriefs, cross-functional reviews, and transparent decision rationales.

2.2 Cultural Barriers to Knowledge Management in Regulated and High-Consequence Settings

Cultural barriers to KM include fear of negative evaluation, low trust, rigid hierarchy, formalism, and weak reciprocity (i.e., people do not share because they do not receive feedback). A review of knowledge sharing barriers posits that perceived risk, absence of incentives, and negative organisational climates function as inhibitors to knowledge exchange even in circumstances where information systems are in place (Chua et al., 2023).

Formalism is a particularly salient concept in regulated environments. In circumstances where compliance assumes a predominant role within an organisation, learning-oriented dialogue may be superseded by defensive documentation and behaviours that are oriented towards producing the 'right answer'. This phenomenon has deleterious effects on tacit knowledge, which encompasses experiential nuances, weak signals, and near-miss narratives. These knowledge types are precisely those least likely to be captured by formal reporting when fear is high.

Recent studies have also established a correlation between organisational culture and capability development, as well as knowledge processes. These findings lend support to the paper's core assertion that culture serves as a mediator in the effectiveness of KM. A recent review in the *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge* synthesises

evidence on how cultural determinants shape organisational capability and knowledge flows, providing a bridge between culture and KM outcomes (Tsakalerou et al., 2025).

2.3 Knowledge Management in High-reliability Organisations: Weak Signals, Vigilance, and Cross-boundary Learning

The prevailing focus in HRO research is on preoccupation with failure, reluctance to simplify interpretations, sensitivity to operations, commitment to resilience and deference to expertise. These principles are compatible with KM approaches that prioritise the detection of weak signals and the rapid diffusion of learning across organisational boundaries.

Recent open-access research in a high-reliability context has reported that knowledge sharing mediates the relationship between vigilant leadership and safety performance. This implies that leadership improves outcomes through knowledge processes rather than through control alone (Li et al., 2025). This finding reinforces the central idea of this paper: that leadership enables reliability by facilitating knowledge flows.

Similarly, healthcare-oriented HRO work emphasises system-wide learning and staff engagement. For example, NEJM Catalyst (2021) suggests that the development of HRO capabilities requires a cultural environment, leadership and established routines that encourage transparency and ongoing improvement. While the primary objective of learning in nuclear security culture (NSC) is security rather than the prevention of clinical errors, the knowledge dynamics are analogous: in both cases, early disclosure and learning reduce the likelihood of severe outcomes.

The paper's emphasis on the elicitation of tacit knowledge and weak signals is aligned with research in knowledge management (KM) on knowledge acquisition and elicitation. A study in *Procedia Computer Science* explicitly distinguishes knowledge acquisition and elicitation as complementary KM processes and emphasises that elicitation requires structured mechanisms beyond repositories (Akhmadi and Tsakalerou, 2022).

3. Conceptual Framework and Propositions

The paper conceptualises NSC self-assessment as an assessment-based KM intervention comprising five stages:

- Elicitation: the capture of tacit knowledge and weak signals through survey items, comments, and discussions.
- Aggregation: the transformation of individual signals into patterns.
- Sensemaking: the interpretation of patterns, including divergences and convergences.
- Mobilisation: the decision of actions and the allocation of responsibility.
- Institutionalisation: the embedding of changes into routines and the repetition of the cycle. (IAEA, 2008).

The leadership mechanisms proposed in this study are refinements of established KM enablers (psychological safety, employee voice, sensemaking and feedback loops) which are aligned to the stages of an assessment-based KM intervention in a high-reliability setting. The leadership of the institution exerts a profound influence on the cultural dynamics that are in place at each stage of the institution's development. The impact of this phenomenon is facilitated by three distinct mechanisms, which are outlined below:

- The process of legitimisation is characterised by the leaders' indication that the disclosure of information is both valued and secure. This, in turn, engenders a perception of credibility in the elicitation of knowledge.
- The establishment of psychological safety within a professional context is of paramount importance, and leaders must take responsibility for creating an environment in which individuals feel able to speak up and take responsibility for their actions.
- Translation: leaders convert assessment knowledge into action via the mechanisms of prioritisation, the allocation of resources, and the establishment of feedback loops.

Table 1 maps the three mechanisms onto KM processes and typical cultural barriers addressed.

Table 1: Mapping leadership mechanisms to KM processes and cultural barriers addressed

Leadership mechanism	KM process enabled	Barrier reduced	Typical leadership practices
Legitimation	Elicitation; initial sharing	Silence; apathy; fear of speaking up	Visible sponsorship; clear purpose; time allocation; credible anonymity
Protection	Voice; learning discussions; deeper sharing	Fear of blame; retaliation; defensive compliance	Non-punitive framing; consistent response; fair accountability; psychological safety
Translation	Mobilisation; institutionalisation	Futility; no change after feedback; formalism	Sensemaking meetings; prioritisation; action ownership; feedback loops; repeat cycles

It is posited that three propositions may be derived from this framework. The following hypothesis is proposed: leadership legitimization (P1) will increase the volume and quality of tacit knowledge and weak signals disclosed during self-assessment. The second point pertains to the notion of leadership protection (P2), which has been demonstrated to serve as a mitigating factor in the context of cultural barriers to knowledge sharing. These barriers, which have been observed to include concerns such as fear of blame and formalism, are believed to be diminished by the presence of leadership protection. The process of leadership translation (P3) has been demonstrated to enhance the probability of assessment outputs being utilised for the purpose of organisational learning and the establishment of sustained change.

4. Methodology

This study employs an embedded case study design, incorporating qualitative and quantitative elements. The case study focuses on a private medical oncology and radiotherapy organisation in Poland that utilises Category 1 radioactive sources. The self-assessment was conducted as part of a research project coordinated by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The objective of the project was to develop a self-assessment tool and to promote security culture among personnel with access to radioactive sources.

4.1 Data Sources and Collection

The data collection process encompassed three primary components: (1) document review; (2) survey-based self-assessment; and (3) interactive elements, including pilot group discussions and subsequent leadership sensemaking. The document review concentrated on the presence of safety and radiation protection procedures, and the absence of explicit nuclear security documentation at the baseline. This highlighted an initial knowledge gap, which motivated the intervention.

The self-assessment instrument was based on IAEA guidance and comprised a title page, instructions, contact details, and statements rated on a 7-point Likert scale from 'strongly disagree' (1) to 'strongly agree' (7), with a comment space under each statement to elicit qualitative insights. The design placed explicit emphasis on anonymity with a view to reducing disclosure risk and encouraging candour. (IAEA, 2017; IAEA, 2021).

4.2 Pilot Study and Instrument Refinement

The project commenced with a pilot testing phase in the radiotherapy department. Approximately 30% of staff (13 participants) completed the preliminary survey. Conduct of the pilot was necessitated by two factors: firstly, the absence of staff, and secondly, operational constraints. The pilot was thus conducted in two waves. The first method employed was a group-based completion with interaction, which comprised seven participants and yielded rich comments. The second method was an individual completion, which comprised six participants and was completed quickly, yielding fewer comments. The team employed a dual-pronged approach of pilot feedback and consultancy meetings to refine items for clarity and contextual relevance.

The pilot produced a key methodological insight relevant to KM: interactive contexts generate more tacit knowledge and narrative explanation than isolated individual completion. This lends further support to the argument that assessment-based KM interventions should deliberately design social mechanisms for knowledge elicitation.

Following the optimisation process, the questionnaire was reduced from 50 to 30 statements, thus enhancing its usability while ensuring the retention of coverage of the key NSC dimensions.

4.3 Final Survey and Participants

The final self-assessment targeted the full radiotherapy department workforce (35 staff) and achieved 97% voluntary participation (34 respondents). The participants were drawn from seven occupational groups. One member of staff refused to participate without providing a reason. In consideration of the inherent characteristics of clinical practice, the completion of the task was structured in a variety of formats. The survey was completed by some groups in pairs or small teams, while others responded individually. The mean duration of the task was 50–60 minutes.

4.4 Analysis Strategy

The qualitative analysis employed a mixed deductive–inductive approach. The deductive analysis entailed the coding of comments and discussion notes against the three leadership mechanisms (legitimation, protection and translation) and the five-stage KM intervention model. The creation of additional codes was driven by the emergence of recurring themes, such as perceived futility, 'right answer' behaviour, and role-based differences. The subsequent step involved the consolidation of the codes into the themes that are reported in Section 5.

The operationalisation of convergence/divergence is outlined as follows. For each statement, convergence was recorded when a minimum of 70% of responses fell within a two-point band on the 7-point scale, and the standard deviation was ≤ 1.0 , indicating aligned perceptions. The occurrence of divergence was documented when responses exhibited dispersion (standard deviation ≥ 1.4) or when two clusters were discernible (e.g., concurrent peaks in low and high agreement), signifying inconsistent experiences across roles or shifts. Divergent items were treated as triggers for targeted inquiry.

Quantitative analysis entailed the calculation of statement-level means and the identification of strength and weakness patterns. Thematic analysis was conducted on the comments and discussion notes collected, with a focus on leadership-related themes. A convergence/divergence analysis was applied: convergence indicated a clear cultural message (positive or negative); divergence indicated disagreement or inconsistent experiences requiring further inquiry.

5. Findings

5.1 Leadership Legitimation: Making Disclosure Possible

The legitimisation of leadership was evidenced by senior endorsement of the initiative, explicit framing of self-assessment as improvement-oriented, and allocation of staff time and expert oversight. Furthermore, leadership established and communicated anonymity safeguards, thereby reducing the fear of retaliation and increasing participation. In the leadership-focused analysis, these actions were regarded as critical decisions that engendered legitimacy and credibility for the process.

Participation provides indirect evidence of legitimacy; a 97% response rate suggests that staff considered the process sufficiently safe and worthwhile engaged with. As demonstrated in the pilot study, group-based completion yielded a substantially higher number of comments than individual completion. This finding suggests that social interaction and permission structures can significantly enhance the disclosure of tacit knowledge.

5.2 Leadership Protection: Psychological Safety and the Reduction of Cultural Barriers

The case demonstrates how cultural barriers manifest in assessment settings. Staff members may approach survey statements as a means of demonstrating compliance rather than as opportunities for reflection, potentially forgoing the inclusion of comments if they anticipate being held accountable or perceive the exercise as futile. The concept of leadership protection has been demonstrated to reduce these barriers by engendering psychological safety, defined as a credible belief that speaking up will not result in punishment or humiliation.

These findings are consistent with the evidence from healthcare just culture that leadership commitment and psychological safety increase reporting and reduce silence (Kumah, 2025; Badran, 2026).

5.3 Leadership Translation: From Assessment Outputs to Learning and Change

The knowledge outputs resulting from the NSC self-assessment process manifested in three distinct forms: The first consists of numerical patterns, which are defined as the means and distributions. The second is qualitative narratives in comment fields. The third is convergence/divergence signals. Translation can be defined as the process of converting these outputs into organisational actions and routines.

The project yielded a comprehensive analysis, encompassing a detailed inventory of the project's strengths and weaknesses, along with a curated list of recommendations directed towards department managers. The results of the convergence process provided unequivocal signals for the establishment of priorities. Divergence refers to a split in staff opinions about a statement. This was treated as a diagnostic indicator of inconsistent communication, unclear procedures, or differing experiences across roles and shifts. The recommended response to divergence was targeted inquiry (in the form of interviews or small-group discussions) to clarify the underlying causes.

5.4 Quantitative Signals as Knowledge Objects

While the survey's primary analytic focus pertains to cultural mechanisms, the quantitative signals it produced functioned as 'knowledge objects' for leadership sensemaking. Even though leaders do not regard mean scores as being statistically definitive, they provide an actionable map of where perceptions are strong, weak, or inconsistent. In the study, leaders employed statement-level averages to identify areas of confidence, such as awareness of policies, and areas requiring attention, including participation in procedure development and the clarity of reporting pathways.

The instrument linked numeric signals to contextual explanations via comment fields, thereby reducing the interpretive gap that often undermines survey-based KM initiatives.

5.5 Convergence and Divergence as Indicators of Knowledge Alignment

A distinctive analytic feature of the project was the convergence/divergence approach. Convergence was defined as the consistency of answers (positive or negative) from most respondents and was treated as a clear cultural signal. The presence of divergence indicated a division in opinions about a statement and was interpreted as evidence of knowledge misalignment. This was due to different subgroups holding different understandings of the same security expectation or experiencing management practices differently.

The way leadership behaviour is exhibited has the capacity to influence the trajectory of conflict, determining whether it will serve as a catalyst for learning or if it will devolve into defensive conflict. When leaders treat divergence as a legitimate diagnostic issue, inviting discussion without searching for 'who is wrong', employees are more likely to supply the contextual knowledge needed to resolve misalignment. When leaders perceive divergence as a reputational risk, they may become inclined to suppress discussion, thereby reinforcing formalism and reducing future disclosure.

5.6 How Assessment Knowledge was Mobilised: Examples of Translation

The recommended responses were categorised into three tiers: firstly, reinforce strengths through routine communication; secondly, address convergent weaknesses through implementation-focused problem solving; and thirdly, investigate divergent items through targeted qualitative inquiry.

The tiered translation logic under discussion here has notable parallels with 'knowledge-to-action' pipelines in KM: first, validation of the signal; second, interpretation with stakeholders; and third, embedding into routines. Examples of translation actions discussed in leadership debriefs included clarifying reporting expectations, increasing leadership presence during drills, strengthening feedback loops after irregularity reports, and involving staff in refining procedures to improve usability. Such actions directly target the common KM failure mode in assessment programmes, namely the collection of data without the demonstration of change, which results in employees perceiving disclosure as futile.

A further translation insight was the importance of repeating the cycle. The project team recommended periodic reassessment, on the grounds that culture and threats are in a constant state of evolution, and that self-assessment should become an integral part of the organisational rhythm (for example, every 18–24 months). From a Knowledge Management perspective, repetition has been found to support institutionalisation, thereby transforming a one-time knowledge capture event into an ongoing learning capability.

6. Discussion

The findings support the central argument that NSC self-assessment can be treated as an assessment-based KM intervention in a high-reliability context, creating a structured forum for eliciting tacit knowledge and weak signals and converting perceptions into shared understanding.

The legitimisation–protection–translation mechanisms provide an explanatory bridge between leadership and KM outcomes. In high-consequence settings, knowledge is not withheld due to its absence, but rather due to

the perceived risk of its dissemination. The process of legitimisation has been found to reduce perceived risk and increase participation. In contrast, the use of protection has been demonstrated to reduce the fear of blame and encourage deeper disclosure. Finally, translation ensures that knowledge does not die at the point of disclosure but becomes learning and change.

The case also clarifies a key tension for KM in regulated environments: compliance is necessary, but compliance mindsets can crowd out learning. When assessment is approached from an audit perspective, the predominant behavioural strategy that emerges is one risk avoidance. When assessment is regarded as a tool for learning, the predominant strategy becomes knowledge creation and improvement. It is therefore incumbent upon leadership to manage the compliance-learning balance explicitly.

The pilot also suggests that facilitated, interactive formats can elicit richer tacit knowledge than isolated completion.

6.1 Theoretical Contributions to KM and Organisational Culture

The present study contributes to the field of KM theory by specifying an assessment-based intervention pathway that is suitable for ethically constrained, high-consequence contexts. NSC self-assessment functions as a boundary object, facilitating cross-role discussion of vulnerabilities without framing contributions as personal failure (Schein, 2004).

The legitimisation–protection–translation mechanism extends leadership–KM models by unpacking leadership into stages that correspond to knowledge processes. The concept of legitimisation affects the dissemination of knowledge within organisational frameworks, with protection influencing the depth of knowledge, which may be tacit or contextualised, as opposed to superficial. Translation, in turn, affects the conversion of knowledge into established routines, training programmes, and governance mechanisms. This stage-based approach has the capacity to complement capability-oriented KM models by demonstrating where interventions are unsuccessful (e.g. strong elicitation but weak translation).

The empirical setting also serves to reinforce the argument that psychological safety is a KM variable, rather than being exclusively a 'people' variable. In environments characterised by a high degree of security sensitivity, the concept of psychological safety assumes particular significance. It is here that the distinction between weak signals and organisational knowledge is determined, with the former remaining private concerns. The case therefore supports the integration of just culture and HRO scholarship into KM's treatment of organisational culture, particularly in domains where the primary learning object is risk and resilience rather than innovation.

7. Practical Implications for Leaders and KM Practitioners

Five actionable implications for high-reliability organisations are proposed:

- Design self-assessment as a KM intervention: capture tacit knowledge (comments, facilitated discussion), not only scores.
- Build psychological safety: credible anonymity, fair accountability, and consistent managerial responses.
- Use convergence/divergence diagnostically: prioritise convergent negatives; investigate divergence via targeted inquiry.
- Create feedback loops: show what changed due to reporting to prevent perceptions of futility.
- Institutionalise cycles: repeat assessments, track trends, and integrate outputs into governance and training.

These findings are consistent with broader evidence on just culture and reporting systems yet extend this to the context of nuclear security culture, where knowledge sensitivity is particularly high.

8. Limitations and Future Research

The study is based on a single case, which limits the statistical generalisability of the findings. Nevertheless, the objective is analytic generalisation: to develop mechanisms transferable to other high-reliability contexts. It is recommended that future research be conducted to test the framework across a range of sites and sectors, including but not limited to aviation security, critical infrastructure and laboratory biosafety.

Evidence indicates that further research is required to explore the interaction between digital tools (e.g. incident reporting platforms, analytics) and cultural barriers. Digitalisation has been found to increase reporting volume, but it can also increase perceived surveillance, thereby reducing psychological safety. A mixed-methods

approach could facilitate the examination of the conditions under which digital KM tools amplify learning as opposed to intensifying formalism.

9. Conclusion

This study examined the role of leadership in facilitating knowledge management in a high-reliability medical setting involving the use of radioactive sources. The study reframed the NSC self-assessment as an assessment-based KM intervention, thereby demonstrating how leadership behaviours shape the conditions for disclosure of tacit knowledge and weak signals, reduce cultural barriers such as fear of blame and formalism, and translate assessment outputs into organisational learning and change.

The proposed legitimisation–protection–translation mechanism offers a portable explanation for why KM initiatives that rely on employee voice and sensitive knowledge succeed or stall. In high-consequence settings, leadership is not merely an enabler of KM; it is the creator of the cultural and governance architecture that engenders knowledge sharing that is safe, meaningful, and actionable.

Ethics Declaration: Ethical clearance was not required because the paper reports anonymised organisational self-assessment data and document analysis without collecting sensitive personal data. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and results are reported only in aggregate.

AI Declaration: The utilisation of AI tools has been instrumental in facilitating language editing, structural drafting, and consistency checking processes. The author was tasked with the review, validation and revision of all content, including the interpretation of findings and the selection of references. The author bears full responsibility for the paper.

References

- Akhmadi, S. and Tsakalerou, M. (2022) "Knowledge acquisition, elicitation, and management in innovative firms", *Procedia Computer Science*, 200, pp. 91–100. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2022.01.208.
- Badran, F.M.M., Khalifa, M.A.E. and Ahmed, H.M. (2026) "From blame to learning: implementing a just culture program for head nurses and its impact on silent behaviour and error reporting among staff nurses", *BMC Nursing*, 25(1), 96. doi:10.1186/s12912-025-04265-5.
- Chua, K., et al. (2023) "Knowledge Sharing Barriers in Organizations – A Review", *TEM Journal*, 12(1), pp. 184–191. doi:10.18421/TEM121-24.
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) (2008) *Nuclear Security Culture: Implementing Guide*, IAEA Nuclear Security Series No. 7. Vienna: IAEA. Available at: https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/Pub1347_web.pdf (Accessed: 13 March 2026).
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) (2017) *Self-assessment of Nuclear Security Culture in Facilities and Activities*, IAEA Nuclear Security Series No. 28-T. Vienna: IAEA. Available at: https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB1761_web.pdf (Accessed: 13 March 2026).
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) (2021) *Nuclear Security Culture in Organizations Associated with Nuclear and Other Radioactive Material*, IAEA Nuclear Security Series No. 38-T. Vienna: IAEA. Available at: https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB1874_web.pdf (Accessed: 13 March 2026).
- Kumah, A. (2025) "Adverse event reporting and patient safety: the role of a just culture", *Frontiers in Health Services*, 5, 1581516. doi:10.3389/frhs.2025.1581516.
- Li, Q., Yang, S.L. and Ye, L. (2025) "Nip it in the bud: the role of vigilant leadership, knowledge sharing, and safety performance", *Frontiers in Public Health*, 13, 1681592. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2025.1681592.
- Ononye, U.H. and Maduemezia, I. (2024) "Knowledge-oriented leadership, psychological safety, employee voice, and innovation", *Informing Science: The International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline*, 27, pp. 1–14. doi:10.28945/5244.
- Phillips, R.A., Schwartz, R.L., Sostman, H.D. and Boom, M.L. (2021) "Development and expression of a high-reliability organization", *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*, 2(12). doi:10.1056/CAT.21.0314.
- Schein, E.H. (2004) *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 3rd edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tsakalerou, M., Abil, A. and Ribiere, V. (2025) "The innovation capability equation: A systematic review of global determinants of SME's success", *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 10(4), 100757. doi:10.1016/j.jik.2025.100757.
- Tsakalerou, M., Tynybayeva, N. and Abil, A. (2025) "Bridging Minds and Machines: Emotional Intelligence as Intellectual Capital for Human–AI Collaboration", *Proceedings of the European Conference on Knowledge Management*, 26(2). doi:10.34190/eckm.26.2.4006.