

Jana Publication & Research

Psychological Safety as a Mediating Mechanism Between Workplace Stressors and Employee Wellbeing A Multilevel Ana...

 VRC22

 BioTech

 Institut Seni Indonesia Surakarta

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid::1:3420743034

Submission Date

Nov 22, 2025, 1:56 PM GMT+7

Download Date

Nov 22, 2025, 3:54 PM GMT+7

File Name

IJAR-54920.pdf

File Size

820.1 KB

27 Pages

10,197 Words

64,576 Characters





19% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.




Filtered from the Report

- ▶ Bibliography
- ▶ Quoted Text

Match Groups

-  **144 Not Cited or Quoted** 16%
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
-  **28 Missing Quotations** 3%
Matches that are still very similar to source material
-  **0 Missing Citation** 0%
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
-  **0 Cited and Quoted** 0%
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 14%  Internet sources
- 13%  Publications
- 7%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

Match Groups

- **144 Not Cited or Quoted 16%**
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- **28 Missing Quotations 3%**
Matches that are still very similar to source material
- **0 Missing Citation 0%**
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- **0 Cited and Quoted 0%**
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 14% Internet sources
- 13% Publications
- 7% Submitted works (Student Papers)

Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1	Internet	www.frontiersin.org	2%
2	Internet	socialworksreview.com	1%
3	Internet	www.mdpi.com	<1%
4	Internet	pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov	<1%
5	Publication	Theresa Antwi, Patricia Mawusi Amos, Simon Ntumi, John Gabla, Sarah Vivian Dav...	<1%
6	Internet	www.nature.com	<1%
7	Internet	bmcpyschology.biomedcentral.com	<1%
8	Publication	Ami Rokach. "Leadership and Supervision", Routledge, 2021	<1%
9	Internet	openpsychologyjournal.com	<1%
10	Internet	www.connect-psychology.ca	<1%

11	Student papers	The University of Texas at Tyler	<1%
12	Publication	Ceyda MADEN EYIUSTA, Ayla Esen. "Fostering Organizational Innovation in SMEs ...	<1%
13	Publication	Xueqin Tian, Heesun Chae, Dian Song, Yu Zhang. "Leader prohibitive voice shapes...	<1%
14	Internet	fastercapital.com	<1%
15	Publication	Priyanko Guchait, Juan Madera, Mary Dawson. "Learning in the service environm...	<1%
16	Internet	ijsab.com	<1%
17	Internet	consortiacademia.org	<1%
18	Internet	jisem-journal.com	<1%
19	Student papers	University of Northampton	<1%
20	Internet	ajot.aotapress.net	<1%
21	Internet	dokumen.pub	<1%
22	Internet	hrmars.com	<1%
23	Internet	rsisinternational.org	<1%
24	Publication	Rui Ma, Haiqing Bai, Jin Cheng, Huichi Qian. "When Fairness Backfires: How Orga...	<1%

25	Publication	Yi-Wen Liao, Hao-Chiang Koong Lin, MengChuan Wu, Yong-Cih Yang, Yu-Ho Chen. ...	<1%
26	Internet	bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com	<1%
27	Internet	www.crunch.co.uk	<1%
28	Student papers	Dublin City University	<1%
29	Internet	brieflands.com	<1%
30	Internet	onlinelibrary.wiley.com	<1%
31	Internet	uobrep.aws.openrepository.com	<1%
32	Internet	www.asmedigitalcollection.asme.org	<1%
33	Student papers	Nyenrode Business Universiteit	<1%
34	Internet	d-nb.info	<1%
35	Internet	ijsea.com	<1%
36	Student papers	Asian Institute of Technology	<1%
37	Publication	Zhaoqi Li, MyeongCheol Choi, KyuHee Joo. "From Observation to Withdrawal: Ho...	<1%
38	Internet	etda.libraries.psu.edu	<1%

39	Internet	spectrum.library.concordia.ca	<1%
40	Student papers	Oxford Brookes University	<1%
41	Publication	Serap ÖZBAŞ, Mine KIR. "The effect of interest in biology on achievement throug...	<1%
42	Student papers	University of Maryland, Global Campus	<1%
43	Internet	ijepr.org	<1%
44	Publication	Cary L. Cooper. "The Routledge Companion to Mental Health at Work", Routledge...	<1%
45	Publication	Yangmin Tu, Tao Zou. "Organizational change during economic downturns: Psych...	<1%
46	Publication	Binna Kandola. "Building a Psychologically Safe Work Environment", Routledge, 2...	<1%
47	Publication	Harold Andrew Patrick, Ravichandran Krishnamoorthy. "Applied Research for Gro...	<1%
48	Student papers	MAHSA University	<1%
49	Student papers	Northcentral	<1%
50	Internet	advancesinresearch.id	<1%
51	Internet	psico-smart.com	<1%
52	Internet	www.cambridge.org	<1%

53	Student papers	Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College	<1%
54	Student papers	Munster Technological University (MTU)	<1%
55	Student papers	University of Sussex	<1%
56	Student papers	Liverpool John Moores University	<1%
57	Student papers	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	<1%
58	Internet	portal-staging.pragprog.com	<1%
59	Publication	Silu Chen, Guanglei Zhang, Anfu Zhang, Jieying Xu. "Collectivism-oriented human ...	<1%
60	Student papers	University of Birmingham	<1%
61	Internet	bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com	<1%
62	Internet	digitalcommons.unomaha.edu	<1%
63	Internet	journals.sagepub.com	<1%
64	Internet	lirias.kuleuven.be	<1%
65	Internet	psychcare.com	<1%
66	Internet	scholar.googleusercontent.com	<1%

67	Internet	www.romayajournal.com	<1%
68	Internet	5dok.net	<1%
69	Publication	Cary L. Cooper, Michael P. Leiter. "The Routledge Companion to Wellbeing at Wor...	<1%
70	Publication	Cynthia Cogswell, Gavin W. Henning. "Maximizing the Impact of Assessment in Hi...	<1%
71	Student papers	Edge Hill University	<1%
72	Publication	Moana Sargent, Ashley Sylvara, Leah Klos, Jacob Gallagher, Kutina Cabrera, Molly ...	<1%
73	Publication	Muhammad Arshad, Ghulam Murtaza, Omer Farooq, Sadia Afzal, Muhammad Mu...	<1%
74	Internet	en.wikipedia.org	<1%
75	Internet	hilpub.uni-hildesheim.de	<1%
76	Internet	link.springer.com	<1%
77	Internet	mro.massey.ac.nz	<1%
78	Internet	www.econstor.eu	<1%
79	Publication	Asram Nur Anas, Hasanuddinn Thahir, Fuad Husain Akbar, Abd. Rahman Kadir, I ...	<1%
80	Publication	Izhak Berkovich, Ori Eyal. "A Model of Emotional Leadership in Schools - Effective ...	<1%

81	Publication	Michael Phillips, Evrim Baran, Punya Mishra, Matthew J. Koehler. "Handbook of T...	<1%
82	Publication	Rick Crandall, Pamela L. Perrewé. "Occupational Stress - A Handbook", CRC Press, ...	<1%
83	Internet	assets.researchsquare.com	<1%
84	Internet	core-cms.prod.aop.cambridge.org	<1%
85	Internet	core.ac.uk	<1%
86	Internet	dergipark.org.tr	<1%
87	Internet	discovery.ucl.ac.uk	<1%
88	Internet	journals.aserspublishing.eu	<1%
89	Internet	journals.lww.com	<1%
90	Internet	s3-ap-southeast-1.amazonaws.com	<1%
91	Internet	submission-pepsic.scielo.br	<1%
92	Internet	theses.uhn.ru.nl	<1%
93	Publication	"The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Team Working and Collabor...	<1%
94	Publication	Abraham Carmeli, Roni Reiter-Palmon, Enbal Ziv. "Inclusive Leadership and Empl...	<1%

95	Publication	Apoorva Pandey, Mridul Maheshwari, Nishtha Malik. "A systematic literature revi...	<1%
96	Publication	Bernard E. Whitley, Jr., Mary E. Kite. "Principles of Research in Behavioral Science ...	<1%
97	Publication	Cheng, Jen Wei, Kuo Ming Lu, Yu Ha Cheung, and Jyh Huei Kuo. "Psychological saf...	<1%
98	Publication	Adrian Lubowiecki-Vikuk, Izabela Michalska-Dudek. "Customer Insight in Tourism...	<1%
99	Publication	Frazier, M. Lance, Stav Fainshmidt, Ryan L. Klinger, Amir Pezeshkan, and Veselina ...	<1%
100	Publication	Milena da Silva Guimarães, Pedro Fialho, Carolina Moliner, Monique Delfim Andra...	<1%
101	Publication	Nerina L. Jimmieson, Deborah J. Terry. "The effects of prediction, understanding, ...	<1%

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.

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

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

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

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

52 1. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

103

104 2. Literature Review:

105 2.1 Workplace Stressors and Employee Wellbeing

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

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

122 2.2 Psychological Safety and Its Importance

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

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

136

2.3 Mediating Role of Psychological Safety

137 Research indicates that psychological safety can mediate the relationship between workplace stressors and employee
138 wellbeing. In high-stress environments, employees who perceive greater psychological safety are more likely to
139 engage in constructive coping behaviors, seek support, and maintain positive mental health (Liang et al., 2012).
140 Conversely, in teams with low psychological safety, stressors may lead to withdrawal, disengagement, and burnout.
141 Mediating models provide a theoretical framework for understanding how psychological safety channels the effects
142 of stressors into either harmful or adaptive outcomes, highlighting its critical role in promoting employee resilience.
143

2.4 Multilevel Perspectives

144 Employee experiences are influenced not only by individual perceptions but also by team-level factors and
145 organizational culture. Multilevel studies have demonstrated that team-level psychological safety shapes individual
146 stress responses and wellbeing outcomes (Frazier et al., 2017). Teams with high collective psychological safety
147 provide social resources, facilitate knowledge sharing, and reduce interpersonal anxiety, which collectively enhance
148 individual wellbeing. Ignoring these multilevel dynamics may lead to incomplete understanding and interventions
149 that fail to address contextual factors. Multilevel analysis allows researchers to examine both individual and team
150 influences, providing a more nuanced perspective on the mechanisms linking stressors and wellbeing.
151

2.5 Empirical Evidence

152 Recent empirical studies provide strong support for the mediating role of psychological safety. Carmeli et al. (2010)
153 found that teams with high psychological safety reported lower levels of burnout and higher engagement, despite
154 high job demands. Similarly, Frazier et al. (2017) conducted a meta-analysis demonstrating that psychological safety
155 consistently mediates the relationship between workplace stressors and positive outcomes, including employee
156 wellbeing. Other studies emphasize the role of leadership in shaping psychological safety, suggesting that
157 supportive, inclusive, and transparent leadership fosters environments where employees can navigate stress
158 effectively (Edmondson & Lei, 2014).
159

160 2.6 Research Gaps

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

166

167 2.7 Conclusion

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

75 3. Methodology

176 3.1 Research Design

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

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

190 3.2 Participants

191 Participants were recruited from multiple organizations across three primary industries: manufacturing, information
192 technology, and service sectors. A total of 350 employees nested within 45 teams participated in the study. The
193 sample included 180 males (51.4%) and 170 females (48.6%), with ages ranging from 22 to 55 years ($M = 34.7$, SD
194 = 7.9). Employee tenure ranged from 1 to 25 years, with an average of 5.8 years ($SD = 4.2$).

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

201 3.3 Ethical Considerations

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

208 3.4 Measures

209 3.4.1 Workplace Stressors

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

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

219 3.4.2 Psychological Safety

220 Psychological safety was measured using the 7-item scale developed by Edmondson (1999). This scale captures
19 15 employees' perceptions of whether their work environment is safe for interpersonal risk-taking. Sample items
222 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."
11 23 Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

224 The scale has demonstrated strong reliability in prior research, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.88 to 0.92
1 25 (Frazier et al., 2017). In this study, the reliability of the psychological safety scale was $\alpha = 0.91$, indicating excellent
226 internal consistency. To derive team-level psychological safety scores, individual responses were aggregated using
32 27 the within-group agreement index (rwg), ensuring that the team-level scores reflected a shared perception of safety
228 within each team.

229 3.4.3 Employee Wellbeing

22 Employee wellbeing was assessed using the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS) developed
231 by Tennant et al. (2007). This 14-item scale evaluates general mental wellbeing, including emotional, cognitive, and
18 32 social aspects. Sample items include, "I've been feeling optimistic about the future" and "I've been feeling useful."
43 33 Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (none of the time) to 5 (all of the time).

1 34 The WEMWBS has demonstrated strong reliability and validity across diverse populations, with Cronbach's alpha
235 exceeding 0.90. In the current study, $\alpha = 0.92$, confirming excellent internal consistency. Higher scores indicate
236 greater mental wellbeing. This scale was chosen for its comprehensive assessment of positive mental health rather
237 than solely the absence of psychological distress, aligning with the study's focus on employee wellbeing as a
238 multidimensional construct.

30 3.5 Control Variables

24 40 To reduce potential confounding effects, the study controlled for age, gender, and tenure. These variables have been
241 shown to influence both perceptions of workplace stress and wellbeing (Ganster & Rosen, 2013). Gender was coded
3 42 as 0 = male and 1 = female, age was recorded in years, and tenure was measured as the number of years employed in
243 the current organization. Including these controls allowed for more accurate estimation of the relationships among
244 the core variables.

2 45 3.6 Data Collection Procedure

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

50 Team-level psychological safety scores were derived by aggregating individual responses within each team. Prior to
251 aggregation, inter-rater agreement (rwg) and intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC1 and ICC2) were calculated to
252 confirm sufficient within-team agreement and between-team variability. The results indicated $rwg = 0.87$, $ICC1 =$
46 53 0.13 , and $ICC2 = 0.62$, supporting the aggregation of psychological safety scores at the team level.

256 3.7 Analytical Strategy

1 57 Data analysis proceeded in several stages. First, descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and
258 correlations, were computed to examine the general patterns in the data. Second, multilevel modeling was conducted
259 to account for the nested data structure, using Mplus 8.0 for multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM).

260 The multilevel mediation model tested three pathways:

- 87 61 • The direct effect of workplace stressors on employee wellbeing (level 1).
- 73 62 • The effect of psychological safety on employee wellbeing (levels 1 and 2).
- 263 • The indirect effect of workplace stressors on wellbeing via psychological safety (mediated path).

7 64 Bias-corrected bootstrap methods with 5,000 resamples were used to estimate the significance of indirect effects,
9 65 providing robust confidence intervals. Model fit was assessed using multiple indices, including the Comparative Fit
266 Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized
41 67 Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Acceptable model fit was determined based on commonly accepted thresholds
268 (CFI and TLI ≥ 0.90 , RMSEA ≤ 0.08 , SRMR ≤ 0.08) (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

269 3.8 Justification for Multilevel Approach

270 The multilevel approach was necessary for several reasons. First, employees' experiences of stressors and
46 71 perceptions of psychological safety are influenced by their team environment; ignoring team-level effects may
13 72 underestimate the role of psychological safety as a shared resource. Second, multilevel modeling allows for
273 simultaneous estimation of within-team and between-team effects, providing a more accurate understanding of the
274 mediating mechanisms. Third, this approach accounts for the dependency of observations within teams, ensuring
275 that standard errors and significance tests are unbiased.

276 3.9 Limitations of Methodology

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

283

284

285 **4. Discussion, Analysis and Findings**

286 *4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Preliminary Analysis*

55 87 Descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the distribution, central tendency, and variability of the primary
 4 88 study variables: workplace stressors, psychological safety, and employee wellbeing. Table 1 presents the means,
 289 standard deviations, and correlations among these variables.

290

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**	–

291 **Note:** p < 0.01

292 The descriptive statistics revealed that, on average, employees reported moderate to high levels of workplace
 293 stressors, moderate to high psychological safety, and moderately high wellbeing. Correlational analysis showed
 294 significant relationships among the primary variables. Workplace stressors were negatively correlated with
 295 employee wellbeing (r = -0.45, p < .01), indicating that higher stress is associated with lower wellbeing.

1 96 Psychological safety was positively correlated with wellbeing (r = 0.52, p < .01), suggesting that employees
 297 perceiving a safe environment tend to report higher levels of wellbeing. Additionally, psychological safety was
 298 negatively correlated with workplace stressors (r = -0.48, p < .01), highlighting the potential buffering role of
 299 psychological safety against the adverse effects of stress.

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

12 03 **4.2 Multilevel Mediation Analysis**

12 04 Given the hierarchical nature of the data (employees nested within teams), a multilevel structural equation modeling
12 05 (MSEM) approach was employed. This method allows for simultaneous estimation of individual-level (within-team)
306 and team-level (between-team) effects, accounting for the shared influence of team-level psychological safety on
307 individual experiences.

308 **4.3 Direct Effects**

309 The direct effect of workplace stressors on employee wellbeing was significant and negative ($\beta = -0.42, p < .001$),
310 confirming that higher levels of workload, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflict are associated with lower
83 11 employee wellbeing. This finding is consistent with extensive literature highlighting the detrimental impact of
312 workplace stressors on mental health, engagement, and life satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Ganster &
313 Rosen, 2013).

8 14 The direct effect of psychological safety on employee wellbeing was significant and positive ($\beta = 0.47, p < .001$).
315 Employees reporting higher perceptions of psychological safety experienced greater wellbeing, supporting the
80 16 theoretical premise that a supportive, non-punitive work environment promotes positive emotional, cognitive, and
317 social outcomes (Edmondson, 1999; Carmeli et al., 2010).

318 **4.4 Indirect (Mediated) Effects**

2 19 The mediation analysis revealed that psychological safety partially mediated the relationship between workplace
1 20 stressors and employee wellbeing. The indirect effect was significant ($\beta = -0.21, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.31, -0.12]$), indicating
321 that part of the negative impact of stressors on wellbeing operates through diminished perceptions of psychological
322 safety. In other words, stressors not only directly reduce wellbeing but also compromise employees' sense of safety
323 in the workplace, which in turn further reduces wellbeing.

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

329 **4.5 Interpretation of Findings**

4.5.1 Direct Relationship Between Stressors and Wellbeing

The significant negative relationship between workplace stressors and employee wellbeing aligns with the Job 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.

360 4.5.4 Team-Level Implications

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

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

369 4.6 Comparison with Prior Research

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

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

381 4.7 Practical Implications

382 The findings have significant implications for organizational practice:

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

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

93 4.8 **Theoretical Contributions**

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

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

102 4.9 **Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

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

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

413 4.10 **Conclusion of Findings**

414 In summary, the study provides strong evidence that psychological safety is a key mechanism through which
415 workplace stressors impact employee wellbeing. Workplace stressors directly reduce wellbeing, but they also erode
416 psychological safety, which in turn further diminishes wellbeing. Both individual-level and team-level analyses
417 confirm the importance of fostering psychologically safe environments to mitigate the harmful effects of stress.

418 These findings have significant implications for theory, practice, and future research, highlighting the need for
419 integrated interventions that address structural, social, and psychological dimensions of the workplace.

420 5. **Recommendation**

2 121 The findings of this study underscore the importance of psychological safety as a mediating mechanism between
422 workplace stressors and employee wellbeing. While traditional organizational strategies often focus on reducing
423 stressors, this research highlights the critical role of fostering a psychologically safe environment in enhancing
424 employee wellbeing, engagement, and resilience. Based on the empirical evidence and theoretical insights, a set of
425 comprehensive recommendations is proposed for organizational leaders, human resource managers, team
426 supervisors, and policymakers. These recommendations are organized into four primary domains: organizational
427 interventions, leadership development, team-level strategies, and employee-focused initiatives.

428 **5.1 Organizational Interventions**

429 **5.1.1 Implement Structured Stress-Reduction Programs**

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

436 **5.1.2 Establish Organizational Policies Promoting Psychological Safety**

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

441 **5.1.3 Integrate Employee Wellbeing into Organizational Metrics**

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

446 **5.1.4 Develop a Comprehensive Health and Wellbeing Framework**

447 Beyond stress management, organizations should adopt a holistic wellbeing framework encompassing mental,
14 448 emotional, physical, and social health. Initiatives such as mindfulness training, wellness programs, mental health
449 resources, and access to counseling services can enhance overall employee wellbeing while complementing

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

452 ***5.2 Leadership Development and Management Practices***

453 ***5.2.1 Train Leaders to Foster Psychological Safety***

454 The role of leadership is critical in shaping team-level psychological safety. Leaders should be trained to encourage
455 openness, demonstrate inclusivity, and respond constructively to mistakes or concerns raised by team members.

50 456 Transformational leadership, characterized by inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration,
457 has been shown to enhance psychological safety (Kark&Carmeli, 2009). Leadership development programs should
458 emphasize communication skills, active listening, empathy, and conflict resolution.

459 ***5.2.2 Encourage Transparent and Supportive Communication***

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

464 ***5.2.3 Promote Inclusive Leadership Practices***

54 465 Inclusive leadership, which values diverse perspectives and actively seeks input from all team members, enhances
466 team-level psychological safety. Leaders should ensure equitable participation in discussions, recognize
467 contributions from all members, and mitigate any forms of bias or discrimination. Such practices not only promote
468 safety but also improve team performance and creativity.

469 ***5.2.4 Implement Feedback Loops and Coaching Mechanisms***

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

474 ***5.3. Team-Level Strategies***

475 ***5.3.1 Cultivate a Team Climate of Trust and Collaboration***

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

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

10 5.3.2 *Encourage Peer Support and Mentoring*

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

485 5.3.3 *Implement Structured Problem-Solving and Reflection Sessions*

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

490 5.3.4 *Recognize and Reward Safe Behaviors*

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

495 5.4. *Employee-Focused Initiatives*

496 5.4.1 *Enhance Individual Coping Resources*

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

501 5.4.2 *Encourage Self-Advocacy and Voice*

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

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.

5.5 **Policy 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**

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

537 **5.6 Implications for Practice and Future Research**

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

47 43 **5.7 Conclusion**

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

550 **6. Limitations of the Study**

2 51 Despite offering significant theoretical and practical insights into the mediating role of psychological safety between
85 52 workplace stressors and employee wellbeing, this study is not without limitations. Acknowledging these limitations
8 53 is essential for contextualizing findings, clarifying the interpretive boundaries of the results, and informing future
554 research directions. The following subsections detail methodological, theoretical, contextual, and analytical
555 limitations that may have influenced the study's outcomes.

8 56 **6.1 Cross-Sectional Research Design**

26 57 One of the primary limitations of the study is its cross-sectional research design. Data were collected at a single
558 point in time, which restricts the ability to draw causal inferences. While the statistical analyses revealed significant
559 associations between workplace stressors, psychological safety, and employee wellbeing, it is not possible to
560 determine the directionality of these relationships with complete certainty. For instance, although workplace
561 stressors were found to reduce psychological safety and wellbeing, it is equally plausible that employees with low
562 wellbeing may perceive higher stress or interpret workplace interactions as less psychologically safe. Longitudinal

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

565 **6.2 Reliance on Self-Report Measures**

67 66 The study relies heavily on self-reported data from employees, which introduces several potential biases. Common
567 method bias, social desirability bias, and response consistency effects may have influenced participants' responses.
568 Employees might underreport stressors or overreport psychological safety due to fear of repercussions, perceived
569 expectations, or attempts to present themselves positively. Although anonymity was assured and validated scales
31 70 were used, the nature of self-report data inherently limits the objectivity of the findings. Future studies could
571 incorporate multi-source data (e.g., supervisor ratings, team observations, organizational records) to mitigate such
572 biases and improve measurement triangulation.

573 **6.3 Potential Sampling Bias**

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

582 **6.4 Limited Scope of Stressors Examined**

583 The study focused on three primary workplace stressors—workload, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflict.
21 84 While these stressors have strong conceptual and empirical relevance, they do not encompass the full spectrum of
585 stressors employees may encounter. Other factors, such as job insecurity, lack of autonomy, toxic leadership,
586 technological overload, or organizational change, could also significantly affect psychological safety and wellbeing.
587 Excluding these dimensions constrains the explanatory power of the study's stressor-wellbeing model. Future
588 research could broaden the conceptualization of workplace stressors to include a more comprehensive set of
589 variables or examine industry-specific stressors.

590 **6.5 Psychological Safety as the Sole Mediator**

13 91 While the study identifies psychological safety as a mediating mechanism between stressors and wellbeing, it does
592 so in isolation. The exclusive focus on psychological safety may oversimplify the complex processes through which
593 stressors impact employee outcomes. Other psychological and contextual variables—such as resilience, emotional

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

598 **6.6 Team-Level Analysis and Potential Aggregation Issues**

38 599 Although the study employed multilevel analysis to examine psychological safety at both individual and team levels,
600 certain challenges related to data aggregation must be acknowledged. Aggregating psychological safety scores to the
601 team level assumes sufficient within-team agreement and between-team variability. Despite meeting statistical
602 thresholds (e.g., ICC values), aggregation may mask individual differences or intra-team dynamics that influence
603 perceptions of safety. Additionally, team boundaries may not be as clearly defined in some work environments,
604 particularly in matrix structures or hybrid work settings, where employees collaborate across teams or function
605 autonomously. Such complexities may weaken the precision of team-level interpretations.

606 **6.7 Cultural and Contextual Limitations**

3 607 Cultural and contextual factors may influence the interpretation and applicability of the findings. Psychological
608 safety, workplace stressors, and wellbeing are socially constructed concepts shaped by cultural norms, power
24 609 dynamics, and societal expectations. For instance, in cultures with high power distance, employees may be less
610 likely to speak up or challenge authority, making psychological safety more difficult to achieve or measure
611 accurately. Similarly, the stigma associated with discussing stress or mental health may influence responses. These
612 cultural nuances highlight the need for caution when generalizing findings to different contexts, especially across
613 regions with divergent socio-economic and cultural profiles.

614 **6.8 Limited Exploration of Virtual or Hybrid Work Environments**

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

621 **6.9 Potential Influence of External Factors**

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

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

628 **6.10 Constraints in Measuring Wellbeing**

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

634 **6.11 Limited Examination of Long-Term Effects**

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

640 **6.12 Summery**

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

648 **7. Conclusion**

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

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

658 *7.1 Integration of Findings*

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

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

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

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

681 *7.2 Theoretical Contributions*

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

75 88 Additionally, the use of multilevel analysis contributes to a growing body of literature that recognizes the nested
689 nature of organizational environments. Employees operate within teams, and teams operate within broader
690 organizational structures. By capturing both individual- and team-level effects, the study provides deeper insights
691 into how shared perceptions and team climates influence individual experiences. This multilevel lens is essential for
692 addressing the complexity of workplace phenomena, particularly those involving interpersonal and psychological
693 constructs.

694 Finally, the research confirms the enduring relevance of psychological safety across different organizational sectors.
695 While much of the early literature focused on high-risk environments or innovation-driven industries, this study
696 demonstrates that psychological safety is a universally important resource, applicable across manufacturing, IT,
99 97 services, and other sectors. This broad applicability strengthens the external validity of psychological safety as a
698 critical construct in modern organizational life.

699

34 100 7.3 Practical Implications

701 From a practical standpoint, the findings underscore the need for organizations to adopt integrated strategies that
702 address both workplace stressors and psychological safety. Reducing workload pressures, clarifying role
703 expectations, and managing interpersonal conflict remain essential. However, these efforts must be complemented
89 104 by initiatives that explicitly promote psychological safety at the individual, team, and organizational levels.

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

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

712 Finally, individual employees also benefit from learning coping strategies, resilience-building techniques, and
713 communication skills that enable them to navigate stressful environments more effectively. Complementary
51 114 wellbeing initiatives, such as mental health resources, flexible working arrangements, and wellness programs,
715 provide additional layers of support.

716 7.4 Broader Significance

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

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

727 **7.5 Final Reflection**

86 728 In conclusion, this study offers compelling evidence that psychological safety plays a vital mediating role in shaping
98 729 how workplace stressors influence employee wellbeing. By integrating insights from organizational behavior,
70 730 psychology, and stress research, it provides a nuanced understanding of the complex dynamics at play in modern
7 731 workplaces. While the study has limitations, its findings underscore the critical importance of fostering
732 psychologically safe environments as a pathway to enhancing employee wellbeing, strengthening team cohesion,
733 and promoting organizational resilience. As workplaces continue to evolve, the concepts explored in this research
734 will remain central to the pursuit of healthy, sustainable, and high-performing organizations.

735 **References:**

- 736 1. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of*
737 *Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
- 738 2. Carmeli, A., Brueller, D., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Learning behaviours in the workplace: The role of high-
739 quality interpersonal relationships and psychological safety. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 27(6),
740 695–708.
- 741 3. Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the
742 literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357–384.
- 743 4. De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team
744 member satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 741–749.
- 745 5. Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open?
746 *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869–884.
- 747 6. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science*
748 *Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.

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

779

780

781

782

783

784

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR