# Psychological Safety as a Mediating Mechanism Between Workplace Stressors and Employee Wellbeing: A Multilevel Analysis


**Abstract**

Employee wellbeing has become a central concern for organizations aiming to maintain a productive, engaged, and sustainable workforce. Workplace stressors, including excessive workload, role ambiguity, interpersonal conflicts, and organizational constraints, have been consistently shown to negatively influence both the mental and physical health of employees. These stressors can lead to burnout, emotional exhaustion, reduced job satisfaction, and diminished overall life satisfaction, which in turn adversely affect organizational outcomes such as performance, retention, and innovation. While organizations have historically attempted to mitigate these stressors through structural and procedural interventions, recent research emphasizes the critical role of psychological and social mechanisms in buffering the harmful effects of stress.

Psychological safety, defined as employees' shared belief that the work environment is safe for interpersonal risk-taking without fear of negative consequences to one's reputation, career, or social standing, has emerged as a crucial factor in this context. Employees experiencing higher psychological safety feel empowered to express ideas, raise concerns, admit mistakes, and seek support, even under conditions of high workplace stress. This capability not only fosters individual learning and growth but also strengthens team cohesion and organizational resilience. Despite the growing recognition of psychological safety, there remains limited empirical research examining its mediating role between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing, particularly from a multilevel perspective that considers both individual and team-level dynamics.

The present study aims to fill this gap by investigating psychological safety as a mediating mechanism in the relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing using a multilevel analytical approach. Data were collected from 350 employees across 45 teams spanning diverse industries, including manufacturing, information technology, and service sectors. Standardized measures were employed to assess workplace stressors, psychological safety, and employee wellbeing. Multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM) was utilized to account for both within-team and between-team variations, ensuring that the influence of team-level psychological safety was appropriately captured alongside individual-level perceptions. Control variables such as age, gender, and tenure were included to isolate the effects of the core variables under study.


UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

The findings indicate that workplace stressors are significantly negatively associated with employee wellbeing, consistent with prior literature highlighting the adverse consequences of high job demands and role conflict. Psychological safety, in contrast, was found to be positively related to employee wellbeing and to partially mediate the negative effects of workplace stressors. Specifically, teams characterized by high psychological safety were better able to support individual employees in managing stress, promoting adaptive coping, and maintaining positive mental health outcomes. These results underscore the importance of cultivating a psychologically safe climate as a strategic organizational intervention, complementing traditional stress-reduction initiatives.

The study contributes to the literature by providing robust evidence of the mediating role of psychological safety in a multilevel context, highlighting the interplay between individual and team dynamics in shaping wellbeing outcomes. Practically, organizations are encouraged to implement interventions such as leadership training, team-building exercises, open communication forums, and peer-support systems aimed at fostering trust, openness, and psychological safety. Moreover, continuous assessment of workplace climate and employee perceptions can help identify areas of vulnerability and enhance targeted support mechanisms.

In conclusion, the findings of this study reinforce the critical role of psychological safety as a mechanism that mitigates the detrimental effects of workplace stressors on employee wellbeing. By prioritizing psychological safety, organizations can not only improve employee health and satisfaction but also enhance overall organizational performance, resilience, and sustainability. This research offers both theoretical insights and practical guidance, emphasizing that addressing workplace stress requires a holistic approach that integrates structural, psychological, and social interventions.

**Keywords:**Psychological safety, Workplace stressors, Employee wellbeing, Multilevel analysis, Job demands, Role ambiguity, Interpersonal conflict, Organizational behavior, Employee engagement, Stress management

## 1. Introduction

Employee wellbeing has emerged as a central concern for modern organizations, given its profound impact on individual performance, organizational productivity, and sustainable human resource management. Wellbeing encompasses employees' physical, psychological, and emotional health, as well as their sense of satisfaction, engagement, and fulfillment in the workplace (Danna & Griffin, 1999). A growing body of research emphasizes that employee wellbeing is not only a desirable outcome in itself but also a critical determinant of organizational success, influencing innovation, productivity, retention, and overall workplace climate (Harter et al., 2003). Despite this recognition, employees frequently face a range of workplace stressors that threaten their wellbeing and compromise their capacity to perform effectively.

Workplace stressors can broadly include job demands, role ambiguity, interpersonal conflict, and organizational constraints. High workloads, tight deadlines, and role overload create significant pressure that can lead to burnout and emotional exhaustion (Bakker &Demerouti, 2017). Role ambiguity and role conflict—situations in which

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

employees are uncertain about job responsibilities or face incompatible expectations—further exacerbate stress and reduce job satisfaction (Kahn et al., 1964). Additionally, interpersonal tensions, such as conflicts with supervisors or colleagues, can erode social support, increase anxiety, and negatively impact psychological and physical health (Ganster& Rosen, 2013). Taken together, these stressors create an environment in which employees may struggle to maintain wellbeing, thereby affecting both individual outcomes and broader organizational performance.

Traditional approaches to managing workplace stress often focus on reducing stressors through structural adjustments, workload redistribution, or procedural reforms. While such strategies are valuable, recent research highlights the critical role of psychological and social mechanisms in mediating the impact of stressors on employee wellbeing. One such mechanism is psychological safety, defined as the shared belief among employees that the work environment is safe for interpersonal risk-taking without fear of negative consequences to one's status, reputation, or career (Edmondson, 1999). Psychological safety enables employees to voice ideas, admit mistakes, seek help, and raise concerns, even under conditions of high stress. By providing a secure and supportive environment, psychological safety fosters adaptive coping, resilience, and overall wellbeing.

Despite increasing interest in psychological safety, there is limited empirical research exploring its role as a mediating mechanism between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing, particularly from a multilevel perspective. Employee experiences are shaped not only by individual perceptions but also by team-level climate and organizational culture. Teams characterized by high psychological safety provide social support, reduce interpersonal anxiety, and encourage collaborative problem-solving, thereby buffering the negative effects of stressors at both individual and group levels (Frazier et al., 2017). A multilevel analytical approach is thus necessary to capture these dynamics and accurately assess the interplay between stressors, psychological safety, and wellbeing.

The present study seeks to address this research gap by examining psychological safety as a mediating mechanism in the relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing using multilevel modeling. Specifically, the study investigates: (1) the direct relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing, (2) the influence of psychological safety on employee wellbeing, and (3) the mediating effect of psychological safety in the stressor-wellbeing relationship. By incorporating both individual-level and team-level data, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of how organizational and interpersonal factors interact to influence employee outcomes.

The findings of this study have both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, the research advances knowledge of workplace stress and wellbeing by integrating psychological safety into the framework of stressor-response mechanisms. Practically, the findings can inform organizational interventions aimed at enhancing psychological safety, improving employee wellbeing, and ultimately fostering sustainable organizational performance. By identifying psychological safety as a key mediator, organizations can develop targeted strategies that complement traditional stress-reduction initiatives, thereby creating resilient, supportive, and high-performing work environments.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

In conclusion, this study recognizes that addressing workplace stress requires a holistic approach that considers structural, psychological, and social dimensions. By investigating psychological safety as a mediating mechanism, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of how employees navigate stressful work conditions and maintain wellbeing. The study aims to provide actionable insights for managers, policymakers, and organizational leaders seeking to promote healthy, productive, and sustainable workplaces.

## 2. Literature Review:

### *2.1 Workplace Stressors and Employee Wellbeing*

Workplace stressors have been widely recognized as significant determinants of employee wellbeing. Stressors can be categorized into job demands**,** role-related pressures, and interpersonal challenges (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Job demands include excessive workload, time pressure, and resource constraints, which often lead to burnout and diminished mental health (Bakker &Demerouti, 2017). Role-related pressures, such as ambiguity and conflict, emerge when employees are uncertain about their responsibilities or receive contradictory expectations from supervisors and colleagues (Kahn et al., 1964). Interpersonal challenges, including conflicts, lack of support, and workplace incivility, erode social resources and exacerbate emotional exhaustion (Ganster& Rosen, 2013). Collectively, these stressors negatively affect employee wellbeing by increasing psychological strain, reducing motivation, and impairing job performance.

Empirical studies have consistently demonstrated the negative consequences of workplace stressors. High workload and role overload have been linked to anxiety, depressive symptoms, and physical health issues such as cardiovascular strain (Sonnentag et al., 2010). Role ambiguity and role conflict contribute to dissatisfaction, absenteeism, and turnover intentions (Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Furthermore, interpersonal conflicts create a hostile work environment, which is associated with decreased engagement, lower commitment, and reduced organizational citizenship behaviors (De Dreu&Weingart, 2003). These findings underscore the critical need for mechanisms that mitigate the harmful impact of stressors on employee wellbeing.

### *2.2 Psychological Safety and Its Importance*

Psychological safety, first conceptualized by Edmondson (1999), refers to the belief that one can engage in interpersonal risk-taking without fear of negative consequences. In psychologically safe environments, employees feel comfortable sharing ideas, seeking help, admitting mistakes, and raising concerns. This safety promotes learning, collaboration, and innovation while reducing anxiety and defensive behaviors. Psychological safety has been linked to numerous positive organizational outcomes, including higher engagement, better team performance, increased creativity, and enhanced wellbeing (Carmeli et al., 2010; Frazier et al., 2017).

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Several mechanisms explain the protective role of psychological safety. First, it fosters open communication and feedback-seeking, enabling employees to address challenges before they escalate into chronic stress (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). Second, psychological safety encourages social support, reducing feelings of isolation and facilitating coping strategies in the face of stressors (Kahn, 1990). Third, it promotes a culture of learning from mistakes, which reduces fear and enhances self-efficacy and resilience (Detert& Burris, 2007). These mechanisms collectively suggest that psychological safety can serve as a buffer between workplace stressors and adverse wellbeing outcomes.

### *2.3 Mediating Role of Psychological Safety*

Research indicates that psychological safety can mediate the relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing. In high-stress environments, employees who perceive greater psychological safety are more likely to engage in constructive coping behaviors, seek support, and maintain positive mental health (Liang et al., 2012). Conversely, in teams with low psychological safety, stressors may lead to withdrawal, disengagement, and burnout. Mediating models provide a theoretical framework for understanding how psychological safety channels the effects of stressors into either harmful or adaptive outcomes, highlighting its critical role in promoting employee resilience.

### *2.4 Multilevel Perspectives*

Employee experiences are influenced not only by individual perceptions but also by team-level factors and organizational culture. Multilevel studies have demonstrated that team-level psychological safety shapes individual stress responses and wellbeing outcomes (Frazier et al., 2017). Teams with high collective psychological safety provide social resources, facilitate knowledge sharing, and reduce interpersonal anxiety, which collectively enhance individual wellbeing. Ignoring these multilevel dynamics may lead to incomplete understanding and interventions that fail to address contextual factors. Multilevel analysis allows researchers to examine both individual and team influences, providing a more nuanced perspective on the mechanisms linking stressors and wellbeing.

### *2.5 Empirical Evidence*

Recent empirical studies provide strong support for the mediating role of psychological safety. Carmeli et al. (2010) found that teams with high psychological safety reported lower levels of burnout and higher engagement, despite high job demands. Similarly, Frazier et al. (2017) conducted a meta-analysis demonstrating that psychological safety consistently mediates the relationship between workplace stressors and positive outcomes, including employee wellbeing. Other studies emphasize the role of leadership in shaping psychological safety, suggesting that supportive, inclusive, and transparent leadership fosters environments where employees can navigate stress effectively (Edmondson & Lei, 2014).

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

### *2.6 Research Gaps*

Despite these advances, several gaps remain. First, much of the existing research relies on cross-sectional designs, limiting causal inferences. Second, many studies focus on individual-level perceptions without considering team or organizational contexts. Third, few studies systematically examine multiple stressor types (e.g., workload, role conflict, interpersonal tensions) within a single framework. The present study addresses these gaps by employing a multilevel design and analyzing psychological safety as a mediating mechanism across diverse stressors.

### *2.7 Conclusion*

The literature highlights that workplace stressors pose significant threats to employee wellbeing, but psychological safety offers a promising protective mechanism. By fostering open communication, social support, and learning-oriented team climates, organizations can buffer the harmful effects of stressors and promote sustainable employee wellbeing. Multilevel perspectives further reveal that team-level dynamics critically shape individual experiences, emphasizing the need for holistic organizational strategies. This study builds on these insights to investigate the mediating role of psychological safety, providing theoretical and practical contributions to the fields of organizational behavior, occupational health, and human resource management.

## 3. Methodology

### *3.1 Research Design*

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional research design to investigate the mediating role of psychological safety in the relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing. A multilevel framework was utilized to capture both individual-level and team-level dynamics, reflecting the reality that employee experiences are shaped not only by personal perceptions but also by the broader organizational and team context (Frazier et al., 2017). The choice of a cross-sectional design allowed for the collection of data from a large and diverse sample at a single point in time, providing an efficient means of examining the relationships among workplace stressors, psychological safety, and wellbeing.

The study adopted a multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM) approach to account for the nested structure of the data, where employees (level 1) were nested within teams (level 2). This analytical approach was chosen because traditional single-level regression methods may produce biased estimates when hierarchical data structures are ignored (Hox, 2010). The multilevel design allowed the researchers to examine the direct effects of workplace stressors on employee wellbeing, the effect of psychological safety on wellbeing, and the mediating role of psychological safety while controlling for team-level variation.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

### *3.2 Participants*

Participants were recruited from multiple organizations across three primary industries: manufacturing, information technology, and service sectors. A total of 350 employees nested within 45 teams participated in the study. The sample included 180 males (51.4%) and 170 females (48.6%), with ages ranging from 22 to 55 years (M = 34.7, SD = 7.9). Employee tenure ranged from 1 to 25 years, with an average of 5.8 years (SD = 4.2).

Teams were selected based on the presence of at least five employees to ensure meaningful aggregation of team-level psychological safety scores. Teams varied in size from 5 to 12 members, and the organizational roles included frontline employees, middle management, and technical staff. Participants were selected using stratified random sampling to ensure representation across departments and industries. This approach allowed the researchers to capture diverse perspectives while controlling for potential confounding variables related to role, department, and organizational hierarchy.

### *3.3 Ethical Considerations*

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the researchers' university. All participants were provided with an informed consent form explaining the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidentiality of responses. Participants were assured that their individual responses would be anonymized and that data would be reported only in aggregate form. Additionally, participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point without penalty. These measures ensured compliance with ethical standards for research involving human subjects.

### *3.4 Measures*

#### *3.4.1 Workplace Stressors*

Workplace stressors were measured using the Job Stress Scale developed by Parker and DeCotiis (1983). This 13-item scale assesses three key dimensions of workplace stress: workload**,** role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflict. Sample items include, "I have too much work to do in the time available" (workload), "I am unclear about my responsibilities at work" (role ambiguity), and "I experience conflict with my colleagues" (interpersonal conflict). Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The scale has demonstrated strong reliability and validity in previous studies, with Cronbach's alpha typically exceeding 0.85 for each subscale. In the current study, the overall reliability for the scale was $\alpha = 0.89$, indicating high internal consistency. Aggregate scores were calculated for each participant by averaging the responses across all items, with higher scores indicating greater perceived workplace stress.

#### *3.4.2 Psychological Safety*

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Psychological safety was measured using the 7-item scale developed by Edmondson (1999). This scale captures employees' perceptions of whether their work environment is safe for interpersonal risk-taking. Sample items include, "If I make a mistake, it is often held against me" (reverse-coded) and "It is safe to take a risk on this team." Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The scale has demonstrated strong reliability in prior research, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.88 to 0.92 (Frazier et al., 2017). In this study, the reliability of the psychological safety scale was $\alpha = 0.91$, indicating excellent internal consistency. To derive team-level psychological safety scores, individual responses were aggregated using the within-group agreement index (rwg), ensuring that the team-level scores reflected a shared perception of safety within each team.

#### *3.4.3 Employee Wellbeing*

Employee wellbeing was assessed using the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS) developed by Tennant et al. (2007). This 14-item scale evaluates general mental wellbeing, including emotional, cognitive, and social aspects. Sample items include, "I've been feeling optimistic about the future" and "I've been feeling useful." Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (none of the time) to 5 (all of the time).

The WEMWBS has demonstrated strong reliability and validity across diverse populations, with Cronbach's alpha exceeding 0.90. In the current study, $\alpha = 0.92$, confirming excellent internal consistency. Higher scores indicate greater mental wellbeing. This scale was chosen for its comprehensive assessment of positive mental health rather than solely the absence of psychological distress, aligning with the study's focus on employee wellbeing as a multidimensional construct.

### *3.5 Control Variables*

To reduce potential confounding effects, the study controlled for age**,** gender, and tenure. These variables have been shown to influence both perceptions of workplace stress and wellbeing (Ganster& Rosen, 2013). Gender was coded as 0 = male and 1 = female, age was recorded in years, and tenure was measured as the number of years employed in the current organization. Including these controls allowed for more accurate estimation of the relationships among the core variables.

### *3.6 Data Collection Procedure*

Data were collected over a three-month period through a combination of online and paper-based surveys, depending on organizational preferences. Human resources departments assisted in distributing the surveys to employees, ensuring that participation was voluntary and confidential. Respondents completed the surveys individually, without the presence of supervisors, to minimize social desirability bias.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Team-level psychological safety scores were derived by aggregating individual responses within each team. Prior to aggregation, inter-rater agreement (rwg)and intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC1 and ICC2) were calculated to confirm sufficient within-team agreement and between-team variability. The results indicated rwg = 0.87**,** ICC1 = 0.13**,** and ICC2 = 0.62, supporting the aggregation of psychological safety scores at the team level.

### *3.7 Analytical Strategy*

Data analysis proceeded in several stages. First, descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and correlations, were computed to examine the general patterns in the data. Second, multilevel modeling was conducted to account for the nested data structure, using Mplus 8.0 for multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM).

The multilevel mediation model tested three pathways:

- The direct effect of workplace stressors on employee wellbeing (level 1).
- The effect of psychological safety on employee wellbeing (levels 1 and 2).
- The indirect effect of workplace stressors on wellbeing via psychological safety (mediated path).

Bias-corrected bootstrap methods with 5,000 resamples were used to estimate the significance of indirect effects, providing robust confidence intervals. Model fit was assessed using multiple indices, including the Comparative Fit Index (CFI)**,** Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)**,** Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)**,** andStandardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Acceptable model fit was determined based on commonly accepted thresholds (CFI and TLI $\geq 0.90$, RMSEA $\leq 0.08$, SRMR $\leq 0.08$) (Hu &Bentler, 1999).

### *3.8 Justification for Multilevel Approach*

The multilevel approach was necessary for several reasons. First, employees' experiences of stressors and perceptions of psychological safety are influenced by their team environment; ignoring team-level effects may underestimate the role of psychological safety as a shared resource. Second, multilevel modeling allows for simultaneous estimation of within-team and between-team effects, providing a more accurate understanding of the mediating mechanisms. Third, this approach accounts for the dependency of observations within teams, ensuring that standard errors and significance tests are unbiased.

### *3.9 Limitations of Methodology*

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

While the methodology is rigorous, certain limitations must be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional design precludes causal inference; longitudinal studies are needed to establish temporal relationships. Second, self-report measures may be subject to social desirability and response biases, although confidentiality procedures were implemented to mitigate this risk. Third, the study focused on three industries, potentially limiting generalizability to other sectors. Despite these limitations, the multilevel design and robust measurement instruments provide strong evidence for examining the mediating role of psychological safety.

## 4. Discussion, Analysis and Findings

### *4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Preliminary Analysis*

Descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the distribution, central tendency, and variability of the primary study variables: workplace stressors, psychological safety, and employee wellbeing. Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations among these variables.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations**

| Variable | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Workplace Stressors | 3.42 | 0.72 | – | | |
| 2. Psychological Safety | 3.68 | 0.65 | -0.48** | – | |
| 3. Employee Wellbeing | 3.91 | 0.60 | -0.45** | 0.52** | – |

**Note:p**< 0.01

The descriptive statistics revealed that, on average, employees reported moderate to high levels of workplace stressors, moderate to high psychological safety, and moderately high wellbeing. Correlational analysis showed significant relationships among the primary variables. Workplace stressors were negatively correlated with employee wellbeing ($r = -0.45$, $p < .01$), indicating that higher stress is associated with lower wellbeing. Psychological safety was positively correlated with wellbeing ($r = 0.52$, $p < .01$), suggesting that employees perceiving a safe environment tend to report higher levels of wellbeing. Additionally, psychological safety was negatively correlated with workplace stressors ($r = -0.48$, $p < .01$), highlighting the potential buffering role of psychological safety against the adverse effects of stress.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

These preliminary results provided a strong rationale for examining psychological safety as a mediating mechanism in the stressor-wellbeing relationship. The moderate correlations also indicated sufficient variability in the data for multilevel modeling.

### *4.2 Multilevel Mediation Analysis*

Given the hierarchical nature of the data (employees nested within teams), a multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM) approach was employed. This method allows for simultaneous estimation of individual-level (within-team) and team-level (between-team) effects, accounting for the shared influence of team-level psychological safety on individual experiences.

### *4.3 Direct Effects*

The direct effect of workplace stressors on employee wellbeing was significant and negative ($\beta = -0.42$, $p < .001$), confirming that higher levels of workload, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflict are associated with lower employee wellbeing. This finding is consistent with extensive literature highlighting the detrimental impact of workplace stressors on mental health, engagement, and life satisfaction (Bakker &Demerouti, 2017; Ganster& Rosen, 2013).

The direct effect of psychological safety on employee wellbeing was significant and positive ($\beta = 0.47$, $p < .001$). Employees reporting higher perceptions of psychological safety experienced greater wellbeing, supporting the theoretical premise that a supportive, non-punitive work environment promotes positive emotional, cognitive, and social outcomes (Edmondson, 1999; Carmeli et al., 2010).

### *4.4 Indirect (Mediated) Effects*

The mediation analysis revealed that psychological safety partially mediated the relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing. The indirect effect was significant ($\beta = -0.21$, 95% CI [-0.31, -0.12]), indicating that part of the negative impact of stressors on wellbeing operates through diminished perceptions of psychological safety. In other words, stressors not only directly reduce wellbeing but also compromise employees' sense of safety in the workplace, which in turn further reduces wellbeing.

At the team level, aggregation of psychological safety scores demonstrated similar patterns. Teams with higher collective psychological safety exhibited higher average levels of employee wellbeing, even when controlling for individual-level stress perceptions. This multilevel effect emphasizes that psychological safety functions as both an individual and team-level protective factor, reinforcing the importance of interventions targeting team climate rather than solely individual coping strategies.

### *4.5 Interpretation of Findings*

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

### *4.5.1 Direct Relationship Between Stressors and Wellbeing*

The significant negative relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing aligns with theJob Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory (Bakker &Demerouti, 2017). According to JD-R, high job demands (stressors) deplete employees' psychological and physical resources, leading to strain and reduced wellbeing. In this study, workload, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflict represented core job demands that challenged employees' coping capacities, resulting in decreased wellbeing.

These findings are also consistent with transactional stress theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), which posits that stress arises from the appraisal of environmental demands as exceeding one's resources. Employees experiencing high levels of stressors likely perceived their coping resources as insufficient, contributing to reduced mental and emotional wellbeing.

### *4.5.2 Psychological Safety as a Protective Factor*

Psychological safety demonstrated a robust positive effect on employee wellbeing, underscoring its role as a protective psychosocial resource. Employees who perceive a safe environment feel comfortable voicing concerns, asking for help, and engaging in risk-taking without fear of negative consequences (Edmondson, 1999). Such an environment reduces interpersonal anxiety, encourages social support, and fosters adaptive coping mechanisms.

The findings support prior empirical evidence indicating that psychological safety enhances both individual and team outcomes. Carmeli et al. (2010) reported that employees in psychologically safe teams experience higher engagement, lower burnout, and increased performance. Similarly, Frazier et al. (2017) found psychological safety to mediate the effects of stressors on employee outcomes across diverse organizational contexts.

### *4.5.3 Mediating Role of Psychological Safety*

The partial mediation effect suggests that workplace stressors not only directly affect wellbeing but also indirectly reduce wellbeing by eroding psychological safety. High stress may create an environment of fear or uncertainty, making employees less willing to take interpersonal risks, share concerns, or seek support. This reduction in perceived safety further exacerbates the negative effects of stress, creating a feedback loop that intensifies strain and reduces wellbeing.

From a theoretical standpoint, this finding extends existing models of workplace stress by integrating psychological safety as a mediating mechanism. Traditional stress models focus on direct effects of job demands on wellbeing; however, this study demonstrates that social and environmental perceptions, specifically psychological safety, are critical mediators. This highlights the importance of considering both structural and psychological interventions in managing workplace stress.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

### *4.5.4 Team-Level Implications*

At the team level, aggregated psychological safety scores revealed that teams with higher collective safety experienced greater overall wellbeing among members. This supports the concept of shared mental models within teams, where collective perceptions shape individual experiences (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). Teams with high psychological safety facilitate collaborative problem-solving, knowledge sharing, and mutual support, which buffer the effects of stressors at the individual level.

These findings suggest that interventions aimed at enhancing psychological safety should target both individual perceptions and team climate. Leadership practices, team norms, and organizational policies all contribute to team-level psychological safety and can amplify the protective effects for all members.

## *4.6 Comparison with Prior Research*

This study's findings are consistent with and extend prior research in several ways:

- **Alignment with JD-R Theory:** The study confirms that workplace stressors deplete employees' resources and reduce wellbeing, consistent with JD-R theory (Bakker &Demerouti, 2017).
- **Support for Psychological Safety Literature:** The results reinforce Edmondson's (1999) assertion that psychological safety is a key predictor of positive employee outcomes.
- **Multilevel Insights:** Unlike many prior studies that focus solely on individual-level perceptions, this research demonstrates the importance of team-level psychological safety, echoing Frazier et al. (2017) and Edmondson & Lei (2014).
- **Mediation Evidence:** While previous studies have suggested a protective role for psychological safety, this study provides robust evidence of partial mediation, clarifying the mechanism by which stressors impact wellbeing.

## *4.7 Practical Implications*

The findings have significant implications for organizational practice:

- **Promoting Psychological Safety:** Organizations should implement programs that enhance team-level psychological safety. This can include leadership training to encourage supportive and inclusive behaviors, regular team reflection sessions, and mechanisms for open communication.
- **Stress-Reduction Interventions:** While reducing job demands remains important, fostering psychological safety provides an additional buffer that allows employees to cope with unavoidable stressors.
- **Team-Based Strategies:** Managers should focus on creating collective norms that encourage sharing, collaboration, and non-punitive responses to mistakes. Team-level interventions can amplify the protective effects for individual members.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

- **Continuous Assessment:** Organizations should regularly assess employee perceptions of psychological safety and wellbeing to identify high-stress areas and monitor the effectiveness of interventions.

### *4.8 Theoretical Contributions*

This study makes several contributions to organizational behavior and occupational psychology literature:

- **Integration of Psychological Safety in Stress Models:** The research demonstrates that psychological safety is a critical mediator, bridging workplace stressors and employee wellbeing.
- **Multilevel Perspective:** By examining both individual and team-level effects, the study provides a more nuanced understanding of how workplace stress operates in hierarchical organizational contexts.
- **Empirical Evidence for Partial Mediation:** The study provides concrete statistical evidence that psychological safety partially mediates the stressor-wellbeing relationship, advancing theoretical models beyond direct-effect frameworks.

### *4.9 Limitations and Directions for Future Research*

Despite its contributions, the study has limitations that future research should address:

1. **Cross-Sectional Design:** The study design limits causal inference. Longitudinal or experimental studies are needed to confirm temporal relationships among stressors, psychological safety, and wellbeing.
2. **Self-Report Measures:** Data were collected via self-reports, which may introduce common-method bias. Multi-source data (e.g., supervisor ratings, objective performance metrics) could strengthen future studies.
3. **Industry Scope:** The sample focused on manufacturing, IT, and service sectors. Future research should test the model in diverse industries and cultural contexts.
4. **Additional Moderators:** While psychological safety was examined as a mediator, other factors, such as leadership style, organizational culture, and personal resilience, may moderate these relationships and warrant exploration.

### *4.10 Conclusion of Findings*

In summary, the study provides strong evidence that psychological safety is a key mechanism through which workplace stressors impact employee wellbeing. Workplace stressors directly reduce wellbeing, but they also erode psychological safety, which in turn further diminishes wellbeing. Both individual-level and team-level analyses confirm the importance of fostering psychologically safe environments to mitigate the harmful effects of stress. These findings have significant implications for theory, practice, and future research, highlighting the need for integrated interventions that address structural, social, and psychological dimensions of the workplace.

## 5. Recommendation

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

The findings of this study underscore the importance of psychological safety as a mediating mechanism between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing. While traditional organizational strategies often focus on reducing stressors, this research highlights the critical role of fostering a psychologically safe environment in enhancing employee wellbeing, engagement, and resilience. Based on the empirical evidence and theoretical insights, a set of comprehensive recommendations is proposed for organizational leaders, human resource managers, team supervisors, and policymakers. These recommendations are organized into four primary domains: organizational interventions, leadership development, team-level strategies, and employee-focused initiatives.

### *5.1 Organizational Interventions*

#### *5.1.1 Implement Structured Stress-Reduction Programs*

Organizations should develop structured programs aimed at managing and reducing workplace stressors. While psychological safety serves as a buffer, high levels of unmitigated stress can overwhelm employees' coping resources. Stress-reduction programs can include workload assessments, flexible scheduling, and redesigning job roles to align demands with employees' skills and capacities. For example, job crafting interventions allow employees to adjust their tasks and responsibilities, reducing role ambiguity and enhancing autonomy (Wrzesniewski& Dutton, 2001).

#### *5.1.2 Establish Organizational Policies Promoting Psychological Safety*

Formal policies that prioritize employee psychological safety should be embedded into organizational culture. Policies may include clear guidelines for error reporting, protection against retaliation, and avenues for confidential communication of concerns. Such policies signal organizational commitment to safety, trust, and transparency, which can enhance employees' perceptions of psychological safety (Edmondson & Lei, 2014).

#### *5.1.3 Integrate Employee Wellbeing into Organizational Metrics*

Employee wellbeing should be considered a key performance indicator at both organizational and departmental levels. Organizations can integrate wellbeing metrics into regular surveys, performance dashboards, and strategic planning processes. Tracking wellbeing data allows organizations to identify areas of concern, monitor the impact of interventions, and create targeted strategies for high-stress units or departments.

#### *5.1.4 Develop a Comprehensive Health and Wellbeing Framework*

Beyond stress management, organizations should adopt a holistic wellbeing framework encompassing mental, emotional, physical, and social health. Initiatives such as mindfulness training, wellness programs, mental health resources, and access to counseling services can enhance overall employee wellbeing while complementing

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

psychological safety initiatives. By addressing both stressors and protective factors, organizations can create a resilient workforce capable of sustaining performance under challenging conditions.

### *5.2 Leadership Development and Management Practices*

#### *5.2.1 Train Leaders to Foster Psychological Safety*

The role of leadership is critical in shaping team-level psychological safety. Leaders should be trained to encourage openness, demonstrate inclusivity, and respond constructively to mistakes or concerns raised by team members. Transformational leadership, characterized by inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, has been shown to enhance psychological safety (Kark&Carmeli, 2009). Leadership development programs should emphasize communication skills, active listening, empathy, and conflict resolution.

#### *5.2.2 Encourage Transparent and Supportive Communication*

Leaders must model transparent and supportive communication behaviors to reinforce psychological safety. This includes acknowledging challenges, expressing empathy, providing constructive feedback, and encouraging participation in decision-making. When leaders respond non-punitively to errors, employees are more likely to share ideas and concerns, fostering learning and resilience (Edmondson, 1999).

#### *5.2.3 Promote Inclusive Leadership Practices*

Inclusive leadership, which values diverse perspectives and actively seeks input from all team members, enhances team-level psychological safety. Leaders should ensure equitable participation in discussions, recognize contributions from all members, and mitigate any forms of bias or discrimination. Such practices not only promote safety but also improve team performance and creativity.

#### *5.2.4 Implement Feedback Loops and Coaching Mechanisms*

Leaders should implement regular feedback loops and coaching mechanisms to monitor employees' perceptions of stress and safety. Structured one-on-one coaching sessions, team retrospectives, and 360-degree feedback can help leaders identify sources of stress, assess the effectiveness of interventions, and adjust strategies accordingly. These mechanisms reinforce psychological safety by demonstrating organizational responsiveness and care.

### *5.3. Team-Level Strategies*

#### *5.3.1 Cultivate a Team Climate of Trust and Collaboration*

Team-level psychological safety is shaped by collective norms, behaviors, and interactions. Teams should actively cultivate a climate of trust, mutual respect, and collaboration. Team-building exercises, cross-functional workshops,

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

and collaborative projects can strengthen interpersonal relationships, enhance trust, and create shared mental models that reduce the negative impact of stressors (Edmondson & Lei, 2014).

#### *5.3.2 Encourage Peer Support and Mentoring*

Peer support and mentoring programs can buffer the impact of workplace stressors. Experienced employees can provide guidance, emotional support, and knowledge sharing to less experienced colleagues. Mentoring relationships foster psychological safety by creating a supportive environment in which employees feel valued, understood, and protected against interpersonal risks (Liang et al., 2012).

#### *5.3.3 Implement Structured Problem-Solving and Reflection Sessions*

Teams should adopt structured problem-solving and reflection sessions to address work challenges collectively. Techniques such as after-action reviews, team retrospectives, and collaborative troubleshooting provide opportunities for open dialogue, shared learning, and collective resilience-building. These sessions reinforce psychological safety by normalizing the discussion of mistakes, challenges, and innovative solutions.

#### **5.3.4 Recognize and Reward Safe Behaviors**

Organizations should recognize and reward behaviors that promote psychological safety, such as speaking up, providing constructive feedback, and supporting peers. Formal recognition programs, incentives, and performance appraisals that emphasize safe interpersonal behaviors reinforce desired team norms and encourage continued engagement.

### *5.4. Employee-Focused Initiatives*

#### *5.4.1 Enhance Individual Coping Resources*

While organizational and team interventions are essential, employees should also be equipped with individual coping resources. Stress management workshops, resilience training, time-management programs, and cognitive-behavioral strategies can empower employees to manage workload pressures, reduce role ambiguity, and navigate interpersonal conflicts effectively (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

#### *5.4.2 Encourage Self-Advocacy and Voice*

Employees should be encouraged to actively voice concerns, share feedback, and seek support when experiencing workplace stressors. Psychological safety is strengthened when employees exercise agency in communicating needs and solutions. Organizations can provide formal channels for employee voice, including suggestion systems, confidential reporting mechanisms, and employee forums.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

### *5.4.3 Foster Work-Life Balance*

Work-life balance is a critical factor influencing wellbeing. Flexible working arrangements, remote work options, and policies that support personal and family commitments can reduce the impact of workplace stressors on wellbeing. When employees feel their personal needs are respected, they are more likely to perceive the work environment as psychologically safe.

### *5.4.4 Provide Access to Mental Health Resources*

Access to mental health resources, such as counseling, Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), and stress helplines, can help employees manage high-stress situations effectively. Organizations should ensure that these resources are confidential, easily accessible, and well-publicized to encourage utilization. Mental health support complements psychological safety initiatives by providing an additional layer of protection for employee wellbeing.

## *5.5Policy and Organizational Culture Recommendations*

### *5.5.1 Institutionalize Psychological Safety as a Core Value*

Organizations should institutionalize psychological safety as a core value, embedding it into mission statements, codes of conduct, and organizational norms. By integrating psychological safety into the cultural fabric, organizations signal commitment to a respectful, inclusive, and supportive workplace.

### *5.5.2 Monitor Organizational Climate Continuously*

Continuous monitoring of organizational climate, employee stress, and psychological safety is crucial for identifying emerging risks and implementing timely interventions. Surveys, focus groups, and climate assessments should be conducted periodically to track trends and measure the impact of interventions.

### *5.5.3 Align Rewards and Recognition with Safety and Wellbeing Goals*

Organizational reward systems should align with psychological safety and wellbeing objectives. Recognizing employees for safe risk-taking, collaborative problem-solving, and stress-reducing behaviors reinforces the desired culture and encourages sustained engagement.

### *5.5.4 Foster Cross-Level Integration*

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Recommendations should be implemented across multiple organizational levels, from individual employees to teams and leadership. Integration ensures that interventions are coherent, mutually reinforcing, and aligned with organizational goals. For instance, leadership development programs should be paired with team-level workshops and individual coping resources to create a comprehensive ecosystem supporting psychological safety and wellbeing.

### *5.6 Implications for Practice and Future Research*

The recommendations outlined above have practical and theoretical implications. From a practical perspective, organizations that implement these strategies can expect improved employee wellbeing, reduced burnout, enhanced engagement, and stronger team cohesion. From a research perspective, future studies can evaluate the effectiveness of specific interventions, examine cross-cultural applicability, and explore additional mediating or moderating mechanisms, such as resilience, emotional intelligence, or organizational trust.

### *5.7 Conclusion*

In conclusion, the study highlights that addressing workplace stressors requires a multi-faceted approach that integrates structural, psychological, team-based, and individual-level interventions. By prioritizing psychological safety through leadership development, team climate enhancement, employee-focused initiatives, and organizational policies, organizations can mitigate the negative impact of stressors and promote sustainable employee wellbeing. Implementing these recommendations will not only enhance individual health outcomes but also foster organizational resilience, productivity, and long-term success.

## 6. Limitations of the Study

Despite offering significant theoretical and practical insights into the mediating role of psychological safety between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing, this study is not without limitations. Acknowledging these limitations is essential for contextualizing findings, clarifying the interpretive boundaries of the results, and informing future research directions. The following subsections detail methodological, theoretical, contextual, and analytical limitations that may have influenced the study's outcomes.

### *6.1 Cross-Sectional Research Design*

One of the primary limitations of the study is its cross-sectional research design. Data were collected at a single point in time, which restricts the ability to draw causal inferences. While the statistical analyses revealed significant associations between workplace stressors, psychological safety, and employee wellbeing, it is not possible to determine the directionality of these relationships with complete certainty. For instance, although workplace stressors were found to reduce psychological safety and wellbeing, it is equally plausible that employees with low wellbeing may perceive higher stress or interpret workplace interactions as less psychologically safe. Longitudinal

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

studies or experimental designs could better clarify the temporal sequence and causal mechanisms between these variables.

### *6.2 Reliance on Self-Report Measures*

The study relies heavily on self-reported data from employees, which introduces several potential biases. Common method bias, social desirability bias, and response consistency effects may have influenced participants' responses. Employees might underreport stressors or overreport psychological safety due to fear of repercussions, perceived expectations, or attempts to present themselves positively. Although anonymity was assured and validated scales were used, the nature of self-report data inherently limits the objectivity of the findings. Future studies could incorporate multi-source data (e.g., supervisor ratings, team observations, organizational records) to mitigate such biases and improve measurement triangulation.

### *6.3 Potential Sampling Bias*

The sampling strategy may also limit the generalizability of the findings. Although employees were drawn from multiple sectors—including manufacturing, IT, and services—the sample may not fully represent the diversity of organizational contexts, cultures, or job types. Participation was voluntary, raising the possibility of self-selection bias: employees who chose to participate may differ systematically from those who did not, potentially in terms of stress levels, wellbeing, or perceptions of psychological safety. Moreover, the sample was concentrated in specific geographic or cultural contexts, which may influence how psychological safety and stressors are perceived. Organizational norms, hierarchical structures, and cultural dimensions (e.g., power distance, collectivism) could affect generalizability.

### *6.4 Limited Scope of Stressors Examined*

The study focused on three primary workplace stressors—workload, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflict. While these stressors have strong conceptual and empirical relevance, they do not encompass the full spectrum of stressors employees may encounter. Other factors, such as job insecurity, lack of autonomy, toxic leadership, technological overload, or organizational change, could also significantly affect psychological safety and wellbeing. Excluding these dimensions constrains the explanatory power of the study's stressor-wellbeing model. Future research could broaden the conceptualization of workplace stressors to include a more comprehensive set of variables or examine industry-specific stressors.

### *6.5 Psychological Safety as the Sole Mediator*

While the study identifies psychological safety as a mediating mechanism between stressors and wellbeing, it does so in isolation. The exclusive focus on psychological safety may oversimplify the complex processes through which stressors impact employee outcomes. Other psychological and contextual variables—such as resilience, emotional

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

intelligence, organizational justice, social support, leadership behavior, and coping strategies—could also mediate or moderate these relationships. The decision to concentrate on a single mediator, while theoretically justified, leaves unexplored alternative pathways or interactive effects that may offer a more nuanced understanding of employee wellbeing.

### *6.6 Team-Level Analysis and Potential Aggregation Issues*

Although the study employed multilevel analysis to examine psychological safety at both individual and team levels, certain challenges related to data aggregation must be acknowledged. Aggregating psychological safety scores to the team level assumes sufficient within-team agreement and between-team variability. Despite meeting statistical thresholds (e.g., ICC values), aggregation may mask individual differences or intra-team dynamics that influence perceptions of safety. Additionally, team boundaries may not be as clearly defined in some work environments, particularly in matrix structures or hybrid work settings, where employees collaborate across teams or function autonomously. Such complexities may weaken the precision of team-level interpretations.

### *6.7 Cultural and Contextual Limitations*

Cultural and contextual factors may influence the interpretation and applicability of the findings. Psychological safety, workplace stressors, and wellbeing are socially constructed concepts shaped by cultural norms, power dynamics, and societal expectations. For instance, in cultures with high power distance, employees may be less likely to speak up or challenge authority, making psychological safety more difficult to achieve or measure accurately. Similarly, the stigma associated with discussing stress or mental health may influence responses. These cultural nuances highlight the need for caution when generalizing findings to different contexts, especially across regions with divergent socio-economic and cultural profiles.

### *6.8 Limited Exploration of Virtual or Hybrid Work Environments*

The study did not explicitly address how virtual or hybrid work arrangements—now increasingly common—may influence psychological safety, stress, or wellbeing. Remote work may alter stressors (e.g., isolation, blurred boundaries, digital overload) and shape the way employees perceive safety in virtual interactions. The absence of such context-specific variables limits the applicability of the findings to modern, diversified workplaces. Future studies could explore how psychological safety operates in virtual teams or how digital communication norms influence stress and wellbeing.

### *6.9 Potential Influence of External Factors*

External factors, such as economic conditions, organizational restructuring, global events (e.g., pandemics), or industry-specific pressures, may have influenced participants' stress levels and wellbeing independently of workplace conditions. Since the study did not control for such externalities, their potential influence cannot be

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

entirely ruled out. The complexity of employee wellbeing means that external, non-work-related stressors—including family responsibilities, financial pressures, or health concerns—could have shaped responses, confounding the relationships examined.

### *6.10 Constraints in Measuring Wellbeing*

The construct of employee wellbeing is multifaceted, encompassing emotional, psychological, social, and physical dimensions. Although this study utilized validated scales, the subjective nature of wellbeing means it may not fully capture deeper or long-term aspects of employees' health. Wellbeing measures may also be influenced by temporary moods, transient workplace events, or seasonal cycles. Including objective indicators (such as absenteeism, health claims, or performance metrics) in future research could strengthen the robustness of wellbeing assessments.

### *6.11 Limited Examination of Long-Term Effects*

The study does not address long-term outcomes of reduced psychological safety or chronic stress exposure. While immediate wellbeing implications were assessed, the cumulative impact of ongoing stressors—such as burnout, turnover intentions, disengagement, or mental health disorders—was beyond the scope of the analysis. Longitudinal approaches could track these consequences over time, offering richer insights into the enduring effects of psychological safety and stressors on overall wellbeing.

### *6.12 Summery*

In summary, while the study provides valuable insights into how psychological safety mediates the effects of workplace stressors on employee wellbeing, its limitations must be acknowledged to provide a balanced interpretation. These constraints highlight opportunities for future research, including employing longitudinal methods, expanding conceptual models, incorporating multi-source data, exploring cultural and industry-specific factors, and investigating the dynamics of virtual teams. Addressing these limitations will deepen understanding and strengthen evidence on the complex interplay between stress, safety, and employee wellbeing in evolving organizational landscapes.

## 7. Conclusion

This study set out to examine the mediating role of psychological safety in the relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing using a multilevel analytical framework. Drawing upon the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, transactional models of stress, and the extensive body of literature on psychological safety, the research sought to illuminate how structural, interpersonal, and psychological factors intersect to influence employees' mental, emotional, and social health. The findings provide robust evidence that workplace stressors exert significant detrimental effects on employee wellbeing and that psychological safety operates as a critical mechanism through which these effects unfold. The conclusions that follow synthesize the study's

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

theoretical contributions, practical implications, and overall significance within contemporary organizational contexts.

### *7.1Integration of Findings*

The results of the study reveal three key insights. First, workplace stressors—specifically workload, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflict—demonstrated a strong negative relationship with employee wellbeing. This reinforces long-standing empirical findings and supports theoretical frameworks that position job demands as primary sources of strain, burnout, and disengagement. High levels of stress undermine employees' capacity to cope, reduce their sense of control, and erode emotional stability, ultimately compromising overall wellbeing.

Second, psychological safety emerged as a significant positive predictor of employee wellbeing. Employees who perceived their work environment as safe, supportive, and free from interpersonal judgment or punitive consequences reported higher levels of wellbeing. Psychological safety promotes open communication, risk-taking, social support, and constructive collaboration—all critical elements that allow employees to navigate challenges more effectively. This finding aligns with decades of research emphasizing that psychological safety fosters learning, engagement, innovation, and resilience.

Third, the study identified psychological safety as a partial mediator between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing. This insight is particularly meaningful, as it demonstrates that stressors not only directly impair wellbeing but also indirectly do so by undermining employees' sense of safety in the workplace. In environments characterized by excessive demands, ambiguity, or conflict, employees may fear speaking up, hesitate to ask for help, or withdraw from collective activities. This erosion of psychological safety amplifies the negative effects of stressors, creating a cycle of strain that further reduces wellbeing.

The multilevel analysis provided an additional layer of complexity by showing that team-level psychological safety also significantly influences individual wellbeing. Teams characterized by supportive norms, collective trust, and open communication create conditions that buffer the harmful effects of individual-level stressors. This highlights the importance of examining psychological safety not merely as an individual perception but as a shared, group-level phenomenon shaped by leadership behaviors, team dynamics, and organizational culture.

### *7.2 Theoretical Contributions*

The study makes several important contributions to organizational behavior and occupational health psychology. Foremost, it integrates psychological safety into mainstream stress and wellbeing models, offering a more holistic understanding of how stressors affect employees. Traditional models tend to emphasize direct effects of job demands, but this research illustrates that psychological mechanisms significantly shape these relationships. By identifying psychological safety as a mediating variable, the study bridges distinct theoretical domains and advances a more comprehensive framework for understanding employee wellbeing.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Additionally, the use of multilevel analysis contributes to a growing body of literature that recognizes the nested nature of organizational environments. Employees operate within teams, and teams operate within broader organizational structures. By capturing both individual- and team-level effects, the study provides deeper insights into how shared perceptions and team climates influence individual experiences. This multilevel lens is essential for addressing the complexity of workplace phenomena, particularly those involving interpersonal and psychological constructs.

Finally, the research confirms the enduring relevance of psychological safety across different organizational sectors. While much of the early literature focused on high-risk environments or innovation-driven industries, this study demonstrates that psychological safety is a universally important resource, applicable across manufacturing, IT, services, and other sectors. This broad applicability strengthens the external validity of psychological safety as a critical construct in modern organizational life.

### *7.3 Practical Implications*

From a practical standpoint, the findings underscore the need for organizations to adopt integrated strategies that address both workplace stressors and psychological safety. Reducing workload pressures, clarifying role expectations, and managing interpersonal conflict remain essential. However, these efforts must be complemented by initiatives that explicitly promote psychological safety at the individual, team, and organizational levels.

Leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping psychologically safe environments. Supportive leadership behaviors—such as open communication, empathy, inclusiveness, and non-punitive responses to mistakes—can significantly enhance psychological safety. Training programs that develop these competencies should be considered essential components of organizational development.

At the team level, fostering collaboration, building trust, and creating spaces for reflection and dialogue can reinforce social support systems that mitigate stress. Structured team practices, such as after-action reviews, mentoring, and peer feedback, help normalize open communication and collective problem-solving.

Finally, individual employees also benefit from learning coping strategies, resilience-building techniques, and communication skills that enable them to navigate stressful environments more effectively. Complementary wellbeing initiatives, such as mental health resources, flexible working arrangements, and wellness programs, provide additional layers of support.

### *7.4 Broader Significance*

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

The contemporary workplace is characterized by rapid technological change, increasing job demands, hybrid work environments, and global uncertainty. These conditions intensify stress and place unprecedented pressure on employees. The findings of this study thus carry heightened relevance: psychological safety is not merely a desirable workplace characteristic but a foundational element for sustaining employee health, engagement, and productivity. By demonstrating how psychological safety mediates the stressor–wellbeing relationship, the study highlights an essential target for interventions that can foster healthier and more humane organizations.

Moreover, as organizations increasingly recognize the importance of mental health, the study provides evidence-based guidance for designing comprehensive wellbeing strategies. Psychological safety is a cost-effective mechanism that enhances the impact of broader wellbeing initiatives by creating environments where employees feel valued, understood, and supported.

### *7.5 Final Reflection*

In conclusion, this study offers compelling evidence that psychological safety plays a vital mediating role in shaping how workplace stressors influence employee wellbeing. By integrating insights from organizational behavior, psychology, and stress research, it provides a nuanced understanding of the complex dynamics at play in modern workplaces. While the study has limitations, its findings underscore the critical importance of fostering psychologically safe environments as a pathway to enhancing employee wellbeing, strengthening team cohesion, and promoting organizational resilience. As workplaces continue to evolve, the concepts explored in this research will remain central to the pursuit of healthy, sustainable, and high-performing organizations.

**References:**


1. Bakker, A. B., &Demerouti, E. (2017). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
2. Carmeli, A., Brueller, D., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Learning behaviours in the workplace: The role of high-quality interpersonal relationships and psychological safety. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 27(6), 695–708.
3. Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357–384.
4. De Dreu, C. K. W., &Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 741–749.
5. Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869–884.
6. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.


UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

7. Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 23–43.
8. Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., &Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113–165.
9. Ganster, D. C., & Rosen, C. C. (2013). Work stress and employee well-being: A review. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1085–1122.
10. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes. *Flourishing: The Positive Person and the Good Life*.
11. Hox, J. J. (2010). Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications (2nd ed.). Routledge.
12. Hu, L. T., &Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55.
13. Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36(1), 16–78.
14. Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. Wiley.
15. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
16. Kark, R., &Carmeli, A. (2009). Alive and creating: The mediating role of vitality in the relationship between psychological safety and creative work involvement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(6), 785–804.
17. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
18. Liang, J., Farh, C. I. C., &Farh, J. L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71–92.
19. Parker, D. F., &DeCotiis, T. A. (1983). Organizational determinants of job stress. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32(2), 160–177.
20. Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., &Mojza, E. J. (2010). Staying well and engaged when demands are high: The role of psychological detachment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 965–976.
21. Tennant, R., Hiller, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., ... & Stewart-Brown, S. (2007). The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS). *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 5(1), 63.
22. Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179–201.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

783

784

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR