PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY; THE PANACEA FOR ORGANISATIONAL SUCCESS IN NIGERIA

Rachel Konyefa Dickson, PhD, OYEINKORIKIYE STEPHAN ISAIAH, PhD

Department of Management Faculty of Management Sciences Niger Delta University
Wilberforce Island Bayelsa State.
Department of Management Faculty of Management Sciences Niger Delta University
Wilberforce Island Bayelsa State.

Abstract: Organisations in recent times are characterised by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA) and given the rapid changes that businesses face, psychological safety is the most important factor for an organisation to have an improved work environment where workers can speak their views and constructively challenge the status quo. To build an optimal organisational environment where employees' potential can be fully realised for the organisation's benefit, leaders need to clearly understand the drivers of employees' psychological safety and, consequently, their efficient performance at the workplace. This research demonstrates how an organisation can achieve psychological safety through inclusive leadership, ethical leadership, high-quality connections, positive organisational climate and work design characteristics. In Nigeria, where hierarchical organisational structures and high power distance preferred relationships are prevalent, this study has provided insight into leadership's role in building and reinforcing psychological safety at all levels of the organisation to encourage proactive work behaviours. This paper concludes that for organisations to mitigate the negative impact of societal culture on organisational silence, they must embrace ethical and inclusive leadership with the corporate ideology of help, build trust, encourage collaboration, demonstrate openness to constructive criticism, and prioritise a culture of psychological safety to achieve organisational success.

Keywords: Psychological Safety, organisational Success, inclusive Leadership.

I. Introduction

In today's business environment, characterised by its dynamic and highly competitive nature, organisations need continuous improvement through learning, change, and innovation, which has become crucial for success (Frazier et al., 2017). Psychological safety, which refers to the perception of a safe environment for interpersonal risk-taking, is a significant cognitive state that plays a crucial role in promoting learning, facilitating organisational change, and enhancing employee engagement (Edmondson, 1999; Kahn, 1990). Scholars have proposed that the concept of psychological safety is gaining significance in promoting the success of organisations in the contemporary business environment (Edmondson & Lei, 2014; Newman et al., 2017). This is due to the increasing pressures organisational members face to engage in exploratory initiatives and the increasing need for firms to continuously innovate to gain new competitive advantages (Dess & Picken, 2000; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996). Psychological safety was introduced to the organisational sciences by Schein and Bennis (1965), but empirical research has only gained significant momentum in more recent years. Previous studies have consistently indicated that psychological safety enables employees "to feel safe at work so that they can grow, learn, contribute, and perform effectively in a rapidly changing world" (Edmondson & Lei, 2014, p. 23).

Based on the findings of several studies, when employees perceive the possibility of satisfying their psychological needs in the workplace, they are more engaged and invest more time and effort in the organisation's work, resulting in greater organisational productivity and competitiveness (Kahn, 1990; Pfeffer, 1994; Brown & Leigh, 1996). Psychological safety is a crucial element within the organisational setting, wherein individuals learn and adopt certain behaviours and norms through socialisation inside the workplace. According to Roussin and Webber (2012), psychological safety increases an employee's job engagement, boosts performance and learning, and decreases the individual's propensity to make wrong decisions. Increasingly, organisations are adopting team-based structures to accomplish their objectives despite encountering significant levels of risk and uncertainty (Wheelwright, 1994). Emerging trends such as increased global competition, emphasis on knowledge-work, innovation, and flatter organisational structure highlight the significance of structuring work around teams (Hans & Gupta, 2018). The team members must adopt a proactive approach towards risk-taking, exploring new ideas and occasionally encountering setbacks, all while working in collaboration with fellow group/team members. This

involves effectively handling differences in status, expertise, and discipline, among other variables, necessitating interpersonal skills and a psychologically safe workplace (Mogelof & Edmondson, 2006). Team members are more likely to engage in cooperative behaviour and develop a sense of responsibility towards their team's outcomes when they perceive their ideas and views are valued and appreciated (Hans & Gupta, 2018). In today's rapidly changing business environment, where learning and innovation are the keys to establishing a successful organisation, psychological safety is the foundation of successful organisations (Konyefa-Dickson, 2023). Only 47% of respondents to a survey by Frazier et al. (2017) who polled employees said their workplace was a psychologically safe and healthy environment.

In Nigeria, where hierarchical and bureaucratic organisational structures are prevalent, little progress has been made regarding psychological safety. In a collectivist culture characterised by a significant power distance index, such as Nigeria, organisations tend to concentrate power in the hands of a select few individuals. Within this cultural context, employees generally adhere to the cultural norm of refraining from intruding into the domain of their superiors (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Consequently, this cultural value poses challenges for employees in expressing thoughts, regardless of the potential value such suggestions may hold in enhancing workplace efficiency.

In this context, leaders are to be listened to, not to be challenged or unnecessarily embarrassed by offering unsolicited opinions or suggestions, and to act in a manner that demonstrates the boss has made a mistake and must be corrected; therefore, silence is the order of the day (Umar, 2013). Organisational silence, characterised by the reluctance to express one's opinions, is prevalent within collectivistic cultures. In such contexts, employees often adhere to an implicit norm that prioritises caution over potential risks, leading to a reduced sense of psychological safety (Joo et al., 2021). In Nigeria, most organisational cultures do not encourage risk-taking or open communication, and leaders reprimand employees with opposing viewpoints, leaving them with the impression that they are not valued and lack control over their work.

Moreover, Hunter et al. (2007) observed that leaders could indirectly influence the climate of a workgroup or organisation by fostering a positive, open, trustworthy, and safe environment that fosters innovation. Previous studies have indicated that favourable organisational climates can foster creativity and innovation (Baer & Frese, 2003; Crossan & Apaydin, 2010; Yang, 2012). Based on the premise that psychological safety promotes learning behaviours within organisations and that learning behaviours may, therefore, be viewed as the key drivers for implementing innovations in organisations (Bstieler & Hemmert, 2010; Edmondson, 1999, 2002; Edmondson & Lei, 2014; Liu et al., 2014; Newman et al., 2017). This research seeks to demonstrate that organisations that practise psychological safety become industry leaders and are competitive in the global market. Given the rapid changes businesses have faced in recent years and the seminal work of Edmondson (1999) on psychological safety and learning, fostering perceptions of psychological safety is an important consideration for organisations seeking to maintain competitiveness. To create an optimal organisational environment where employees' potential can be fully realised for the organisation's benefit, leaders must thoroughly understand the factors influencing employees' psychological safety and, consequently, their productive workplace performance. Therefore, this research paper examines the dynamics of psychological safety as the panacea for organisational success.

II. Literature Review

The Concept of Psychological Safety

Psychological safety is an emerging concept, and the literature indicates that awareness of it could improve human development and empower individuals to initiate change in their personal development and the development of work teams (Wanless, 2016; Fransen et al., 2011). In contemporary times, the execution of tasks within organisations is characterised by a collaborative approach, wherein individuals exchange information and ideas, coordinate their efforts, and integrate diverse viewpoints (Edmondson, 2003). This collaborative work dynamic is necessitated by the need for individuals to work collectively towards achieving organisational objectives. Nevertheless, establishing interdependency among team members can be challenging due to differences in their ability to collaborate effectively (Hackman, 1990). Psychological safety is defined here as employees' perceptions of the consequences of taking interpersonal risks in the workplace, which influences their willingness to "express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances" as opposed to defending "themselves" (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). In other words, when employees have no fears about voicing their opinions, they will be less concerned about potential negative outcomes, making them more likely to speak up (Pacheco et al., 2015). According to a Google Project Aristotle study, the main driver of a team's success was psychological safety (McWilliam & Toner, 2021). The research examined data from a sample of more than 200 teams inside the company, revealing that the teams exhibiting the highest levels of effectiveness displayed several shared characteristics, including psychological safety. Google introduced a program known as "g2g" (Googler-to-

Googler) in response to these findings (McWilliam & Toner, 2021). In a team that fosters psychological safety, individuals experience a sense of comfort and safety when it comes to asking questions, owning mistakes, and questioning established norms. This environment promotes enhanced communication, improved problem-solving capacity and increased engagement levels.

Chen et al. (2015) assert that the concept of psychological safety was initially introduced by Maslow (1945) in his hierarchy of needs. Maslow defined psychological safety as confidence and freedom from fear and anxiety. Specifically, it includes an individual's perception of meeting present and future needs. According to Maslow's (1943) "A Theory of Human Motivation," individuals have distinct motivational systems independent of rewards and unconscious needs and developed a five-stage model known as the 'Hierarchy of Needs', which are self-actualisation, esteem, love and belonging, safety and psychological needs. In his study, McLeod (2007) refers to Maslow's theory and expounds upon the significance of safety and self-esteem needs. According to McLeod (2007), it is a fundamental need for all individuals to have a sense of safety and security, be free from fear, and need self-respect and the respect of others. Maslow's theories are considered a precedent for understanding human motivation in group efforts to achieve shared objectives. Based on this premise, Edmondson & Lei (2014) state that psychological safety within a group environment diminishes interpersonal risk, addresses group anxiety and fosters an atmosphere where individuals feel comfortable expressing their ideas, fears, and opinions without fear of being judged. Jerome (2013) observed the potential for applying the two lower-order needs in Maslow's theory of safety and psychological needs within the organisational culture. Jerome suggests that employees can progress towards achieving self-actualisation by fostering positive interactions within management structures. Several variables may hinder individuals from engaging in interpersonal risk-taking, such as the need to uphold self-esteem, confidence, and reputation and the need for acceptance within a group. Therefore, when exploring the application of Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory inside an organisational setting, it becomes evident that employees need a safe work environment to cultivate the motivation necessary to pursue higher-level needs (Schepers et al., 2008). Hence, fostering psychological safety within an organisation can enable team members to fulfil their needs effectively, thus creating a team dynamic characterised by enhanced communication and cohesion (Lerner, 2015).

According to Schein and Bennis (1965), the concept of psychological safety entails reducing perceived risks, eliminating barriers to change, and establishing an environment that fosters experimentation and accepts failure without negative consequences such as retaliation, abandonment, or shame. At its core, psychological safety eliminates interpersonal risks arising from organisational change and uncertainty. Schein (1985) noted that psychological safety enables individuals to relinquish self-protective behaviours and collaborate toward achieving common goals and effective problem-solving.

According to Kahn (1990), psychological safety can be defined as an individual's perception of being able to freely express and utilise their abilities without fear of facing negative outcomes to their self-image, status, or career. Kahn (1990) noted that psychological safety significantly impacts employees' inclination to openly express themselves in physical, emotional, and cognitive aspects during the execution of their job responsibilities, as opposed to resorting to withdrawal, disengagement, and defensive behaviours. Nevertheless, Brown and Leigh (1996) expanded upon Kahn's (1990) concept of psychological safety by proposing that it includes an employee's perception of three distinct climate dimensions. These dimensions include (a) the degree to which management is perceived as flexible and supportive, allowing employees to have control over their work and the processes they employ to achieve their tasks; (b) the clarity of organisational roles and norms; and (c) the extent to which employees feel comfortable expressing their genuine emotions and fundamental aspects of their self-identities within their work roles. Subsequently, Edmondson (1999) defined psychological safety as "people's perceptions of the consequences of taking interpersonal risks in a group setting".

Consequently, though Schein & Bennis (1965) and Kahn (1990) concentrated on individual perceptions of psychological safety, Brown & Leigh (1996) defined it at the organisational level, and Edmondson's (1999) initial studies depict psychological safety as a team construct. The various definitions of the psychological safety construct share a common principle: the significance of establishing a work environment that minimises perceptions of interpersonal risk. Edmondson & Lei (2014, p. 24) noted that a recurring focus in studies on psychological safety is its role in promoting the voluntary participation of individuals in generating ideas and actions for achieving a common goal.

Psychological safety relates to the collective perception among persons regarding the potential outcomes of voluntarily taking interpersonal risks within a specific setting (Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson & Lei, 2014). A psychologically safe environment refers to a context where individuals collectively perceive themselves to be safe from prospective negative consequences associated with engaging in actions often considered to involve interpersonal risks (Newman et al., 2017). In other words, psychological safety is the state in which individuals feel

safe enough to engage in learning behaviours without excessive worry about potential embarrassment or threat from others' reactions (Edmondson, 1999). These learning behaviours include "sharing information, requesting feedback, asking for help, discussing mistakes, and experimenting" (Edmondson, 1999). These learning behaviours are potentially essential to addressing underlying obstacles to innovation within organisations, such as internal inertia and resistance to change (Dess & Picken, 2000). Ultimately, psychological safety improves the quality of innovative endeavours by facilitating these behaviours. This notion aligns with the belief that individuals need psychological safety to participate in the exploratory and experimental behaviours inherent in innovation processes (Un, 2010). Moreover, existing research supports the notion that psychological safety promotes innovation. This is primarily due to its ability to facilitate open communication, enhancing shared information quality. Additionally, psychological safety encourages individuals to ask questions and present differing viewpoints, all of which are recognised as inherently psychologically challenging behaviours (Lee et al., 2011; Post, 2012; Argyris & Schön, 1978; Edmondson, 2002)

Drivers of Psychological Safety in an Organization

Edmondson (1999) posits that psychological safety is a shared construct that varies among teams within an organisation. Edmondson and Mogelof (2005) proposed the effects of organisational culture, team leader behaviour, team member interactions, and individual personality differences on psychological safety. The following are factors that promote psychological safety in the workplace:

Inclusive Leadership

Psychological safety is an essential leadership responsibility because it can make or break an employee's contribution, growth, learning, and collaboration (Edmondson, 2019). In their meta-analytic analysis of psychological safety, Frazier et al. (2017) observed a positive correlation between leadership and psychological safety. Therefore, the role of the leader is of utmost importance in influencing the work environment and creating an atmosphere of psychological safety. Carmeli et al. (2010) describe inclusive leadership as leaders who demonstrate accessibility, transparency, and availability in their interactions with followers. According to Nembhard and Edmondson (2006), inclusive leadership refers to a leader's verbal and behavioural expressions that display recognition and encouragement for the contributions made by their followers. Edmonson (2004) states that the demonstration of availability, openness, and accessibility by leaders can potentially promote the development of psychological safety inside the workplace. Therefore, leaders can inspire and encourage employees to develop innovative ideas and embrace risk-taking. This can be achieved by effective communication that emphasises the value of these behaviours while also assuring employees that they will not encounter any undesirable consequences due to their actions (Carmeli et al., 2010). Inclusive leadership relates to the leader's effort to involve team members in decision-making and conversations, particularly when their opinions and voices could otherwise be overlooked. According to Hirak et al. (2012), providing resources by inclusive leaders, fair treatment, and fault-tolerant procedures can successfully predict employees' sense of psychological safety.

The concept of inclusive leadership relates to the coaching behaviour exhibited by team leaders. This behaviour involves actions that facilitate group processes, providing feedback and clarification (Edmondson, 1999). Inclusive leadership is also associated with participative leadership, which involves team leaders consulting with their employees, engaging in shared decision-making, and delegating decision-making authority to subordinates (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Inclusive leadership relates to behaviours that, through explicit invitation, have a favourable impact on the team's psychological safety and encourage people to voice their opinions (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006). Hence, an inclusive leadership style is characterised by being helpful, interactive, fair, and tolerant of mistakes, considered a crucial contextual factor inside organisations since it substantially influences the behaviours exhibited by subordinates (Zeng et al., 2020). In the same view, Bienefeld and Grote (2014) examined the influence of psychological safety on speaking up in teams within Aircrews. Due to the hierarchical nature of aircrews, it can be challenging to speak up, even in the face of mistakes. On the other hand, a crew member's silence in the face of an error can lead to disaster. Benfield & Grote (2014) suggested that inclusive leaders would promote psychological safety, allowing aircrew members to feel secure speaking up, i.e., speaking to the leader when an error is detected.

Nigerian society is highly hierarchical regarding power relations, and benevolent autocracy is the preferred leadership style. Research reveals that Nigeria ranks poorly on several dimensions of inclusion, including social and government inclusion, with a weak national antidiscrimination legal framework that affords organisations adequate managerial autonomy on diversity-related issues (SHRM, 2009; Adeleye et al., 2012). The inability of Nigerian firms to practise inclusive leadership influences employees' attitudes towards organisational goals, as workers who are near to power or assumed to have special skills carve out a niche of supremacy for themselves, thereby limiting the creative ability of others (Yucel et al., 2014). Innovation has become crucial in determining a company's success as numerous businesses compete to meet customers' shifting demands (Osman et al., 2015; Deshpande, 2012). Dutta

et al. (2018) established a correlation between inclusive leadership and innovative employee behaviour and provided evidence that inclusive leadership reduces stigma, abuse, and the perception that workers are excluded from firms' decision-making processes. Because a "psychologically safe environment enables divergent thinking, creativity, and risk-taking and motivates participation in exploratory and exploitative learning", these behaviours positively impact innovation within organisations (Edmondson & Lei 2014; Andersson et al. 2020). Therefore, to achieve success in the global market, effectively navigate fierce competition, and bring about industry disruption, Nigerian firms must adopt inclusive leadership behaviours, fostering an environment of psychological safety.

Ethical Leadership

Ethical leadership is pivotal in shaping the organisational climate and serves as the bedrock for fostering psychological safety. Edmondson (1999) posits that psychological safety encompasses more than basic perceptions and observations of elevated levels of trust among individuals. Leaders have a crucial responsibility to eliminate obstacles and inspire their followers to voice their problems and share their thoughts (Sanak, 2017). In environments with a high level of psychological safety, leaders emphasise the significance of this behaviour and guarantee that it will not harm the individual or the work unit (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). Thus, ethical leadership is essential for fostering psychological safety in work environments. It emphasises a leader's responsibility to create a safe and secure environment where employees feel like they belong, have a voice, and can learn and grow (Aboud et al., 2023). Ethical leadership is demonstrating normatively appropriate behaviour through personal actions and interpersonal relationships and promoting such behaviour to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making (Brown et al. 2005, p. 120). Based on this definition, it is evident that ethical leaders demonstrate attributes such as empathy, consideration, reliability, and respect while also displaying attentiveness toward their employees. These are the same characteristics that Edmondson (1999) identified as essential to developing psychological safety. Hence, it is not unexpected that a positive association exists between ethical leadership and the prediction of psychological safety (Reiter-Palmon & Millier, 2023).

Honest and truthful relationships with their followers are important to leaders with high moral standards. When leaders are honest and open with their followers, it builds trust and respect between them and the leader and among the followers themselves (Engelbrecht et al., 2017). Previous studies have demonstrated that ethical leadership has a beneficial influence on employees' attitudes, facilitating the formation of moral identities and fostering the adoption of citizenship-style behaviours within their respective organisations (Brown and Treviño, 2006; Lu et al., 2011; Walumbwa et al., 2011b; Zhu et al., 2015; Chen and Hou, 2016). Ethical leaders influence their followers' attitudes by displaying moral behaviours such as honesty, trustworthiness, and fairness, giving them more opportunities to engage in voice behaviours. Additionally, ethical leaders are forthright with information and have high moral standards. Engelbrecht et al. (2017) found that when leaders share information and explain why doing the right thing is crucial, trust between them and their subordinates increases. This is accomplished by setting a good example and letting subordinates know that actions that make it difficult for employees to trust one another, such as individual rent-seeking and social undermining, are not permitted. Ethical leaders "give followers a voice" by calling out unethical behaviour in public and emphasising doing the right thing, according to the ethical leadership theory (Aboud et al., 2023). Ethical leaders cultivate a learning culture and embrace a growth mindset by regarding mistakes as opportunities for growth, encouraging experimentation, and fostering a psychologically safe environment where individuals are not afraid to take risks or make mistakes (Yeager & Dweck, 2020). Individuals feel supported and encouraged to experiment with new ideas without fear of being judged or punished, which fosters an environment conducive to learning and innovation.

The corruption perception index (Transparency International, 2021) confirms that Nigeria, a developing country in sub-Saharan Africa, is beset by corruption. According to Marquette (2012, p. 15), "...people who live in highly corrupt countries tend to condemn corruption regardless of religion." However, they may also believe that their corruption is justified due to the systemic nature of the problem." Consequently, there has been a rise in the number of failed businesses in Nigeria, and most of them have been traced to unethical behaviour by company leaders and employees (Agha et al., 2017). Organisational leaders cannot shirk their responsibilities to set a moral example for their subordinates, as formal ethical codes and ethical training have little chance of success if leaders' behaviours and actions do not align with what they teach (Chanderjeet, 2018). Employees desire leaders who are trustworthy, credible, respectful, and fair (Agha et al., 2017). If executives are perceived to be unscrupulous and indifferent in their business dealings with others, their employees will likely receive the same message (Crane and Matten, 2014).

Ethical leaders support and promote ethical principles within the organisation, serve as role models by adhering to ethical behaviour, and communicate these values to their subordinates (Wood et al., 2021). In such an environment,

employees develop trust in the organisation, demonstrating positive behavioural outcomes and promoting voice behaviours (Eluwole et al., 2022). According to the social learning theory, leaders who go out of their way to make the workplace equitable are held up as models for others to emulate (Bandura, 1977). Leaders who prioritise ethics set a good example for their teams and encourage their followers to share their ideas for enhancing the ethical climate of the workplace and its procedures and operations (Aboud et al., 2023). If leaders want their employees to speak up, they have an ethical obligation to provide a secure environment and encourage their followers' voices (Zhu et al., 2022). By exercising ethical leadership, leaders build an atmosphere where individuals feel safe, respected, and empowered to contribute their ideas and perspectives, fostering collaboration, innovation, and organisational success.

High-Quality Interpersonal Relationships

Psychological safety is fostered within a work environment when individuals form interpersonal relationships characterised by trust and mutual support (Kahn, 1990). Interpersonal relationships in work settings majorly influence individuals and their engagement in interpersonal social behaviours, as well as fundamental processes like coordination and error detection (Carmeli et al., 2008). Good interpersonal relationships foster perceptions of psychological safety, a key mechanism for learning behaviours such as seeking feedback because good interpersonal relationships reduce excessive concern about others' reactions (Edmondson, 2002). Organisations' Interpersonal relationships involve coordination and information exchange to enhance work processes and outcomes (Berscheid & Ammazzalorso, 2004). They include emotional carrying capacity, tensility, connectivity, positive regard, and reciprocity for long-term work partnerships (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). Trust is a defining characteristic of interpersonal relationships. May et al. (2004) investigated how affective and supportive trust-building interpersonal relationships resulted in greater psychological safety and found a significant and positive correlation between interpersonal relations and psychological safety. Lewin and Regine (2000) found that in the workplace, members engage in learning behaviours that assist the organisation in achieving its objectives primarily through high-quality relationships. Carmeli et al. (2009) noted that individuals in high-quality relationships could express negative emotions and are more likely to speak up without fear of retribution. According to Dutton and Heaphy (2003), when workplace relationships provide a greater emotional carrying capacity, employees can openly express a range of emotions within these relationships, which enhances the likelihood of these emotions being understood and acknowledged by others.

According to Carmeli et al. (2009), high-quality relationships exhibit a significant degree of tensility, denoting their capacity to adapt and function in the face of conflict, stress, and failures. The presence of psychological safety within a work environment is characterised by an increased level of interconnectivity among individuals, which promotes the absence of defensive reactions and enables employees to embrace new challenges and express their thoughts and concerns openly (Carmeli et al., 2009; Losada & Heaphy, 2004). Connectivity alludes to the degree of openness within a relationship towards new ideas and the ability to counteract practices that impede the creation of new ideas. Positive regard and mutuality facilitate high organisational learning (Carmeli et al., 2009), whereas the subjective experience of vitality is related to providing the necessary energy for organisational outcomes. Positive regard and mutuality facilitate high organisational learning (Carmeli et al., 2009), whereas the subjective experience of vitality is related to providing the necessary energy to organisational outcomes. Positive regard refers to a sense of closeness and the extent to which individuals feel known, cherished, and respected by others (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003; Quinn & Quinn, 2002). Mutuality strengthens employees' willingness to reveal errors to their leaders, and a leader's appreciation of mutuality creates a safe atmosphere for individuals (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). Consequently, when there is a high level of mutuality in a relationship, there is a greater level of mutual empathy, which promotes psychological safety. Leaders must emphasise shared goals, the sharing of knowledge about work tasks, and open communication to promote mutual respect and a psychologically safe work climate.

As challenges confronting organisations have become more complex and work has become more interdependent, it has become apparent that solutions to these concerns cannot be developed by a single individual (Kozlowski & Bell, 2008; Paulus & Nijstad, 2003). In high-performing firms, it is usual for coworkers to assist one another in doing their best work. However, in today's era of knowledge work, when successful company outcomes are dependent on originality and the complexity of projects, mutual help is more important than ever (Amabile et al., 2014). Psychological safety is associated with team members' willingness to discuss information openly, share information, and offer input (Burke et al., 2006; Edmondson, 2004; Salas et al., 2005). To cultivate strong interpersonal connections, effective leadership must proactively cultivate a culture of helpfulness inside businesses, as such behaviour does not manifest spontaneously among team members. One illustrative instance is the IDEO culture characterised by collaborative help, which contributes to its status as a highly effective organisation. IDEO is

widely recognised globally for its groundbreaking contributions in various sectors, such as business, government, and healthcare. Consequently, it is frequently sought after by other companies seeking guidance on enhancing their innovation capacities (Amabile et al., 2014). The leaders at IDEO demonstrate their commitment to mutual help through their active engagement in providing and seeking help. The discovery that trustworthiness is a prerequisite for being ranked highly on an individual's helper list at IDEO aligns with the argument made by Edmondson (2001) that groups function more efficiently when their members feel safe in openly discussing mistakes and challenges with one another. The provision of valuable help in the workplace has been found to have a positive impact on individual's emotional well-being, as well as their perceptions of their team members, leaders, and the overall organisation, thereby enhancing individuals' intrinsic motivation and fostering an environment of psychological safety (Amabile et al., 2014). Nigerian society is strongly inclined towards collectivism, wherein a collaborative approach facilitates common ownership of resources and joint endeavours. In this context, the concept of trust assumes significant importance. Hence, to enhance productivity within Nigerian organisations, they must move away from solely depending on individual geniuses within their workforce. Instead, organisational leadership must diligently develop an environment of trust throughout the entire organisation (Amabile et al., 2014). This can be achieved by creating opportunities and spaces for individuals from diverse disciplines and functions to engage in informal and regular interactions. Additionally, training all organisation members on efficient approaches to seeking, discovering, providing, and accepting help is crucial.

Positive Organisational Climate

Organisational climate is employees' collective attitude towards the organisation, which is formed through employee interactions and influences the conduct of employees within the organisation (Burton et al., 2004; Manning et al., 2005). Organisational climate is policies, practises, and procedures in psychologically meaningful terms that are regarded as objective properties of the organisation and tend to persist for a long time (Rentsch, 1990). Hence, the organisational climate includes the entirety of the experiences of individual employees. According to Brown and Brooks (2002), an organisation's practises, procedures, and rewards determine how employees perceive its culture. Frazier et al. (2017) state that a positive organisational climate is the primary factor influencing a team's psychological safety. This environment is characterised by employees who appreciate and recognise each other's contributions, demonstrate concern for each other's welfare, and have the opportunity to participate in decision-making processes related to the team's work. Leadership can create a positive organisational climate by coordinating relationships effectively. Gittell (2003) states that the facilitation of coordination is achieved through establishing high-quality communication and relationships. Effective communication is characterised by regular, prompt, and precise exchange of information, with a focus on resolving issues rather than resorting to blame or avoidance tactics. Open communication increases a person's energy, enthusiasm, and zeal for organisational success when they feel safe at work (Edmondson, 2002; Sherman, 2013). Psychological safety among employees is contingent upon establishing an environment characterised by trust within the organisational context. Trust is a concept linked to several important factors in organisational contexts, such as profits, innovation, organisational survival, and critical worker perceptions and behaviours (Shockley-Zalabak et al., 1999).

Organisational trust refers to the optimistic beliefs that individuals hold regarding the intentions and actions of various members within an organisation formed based on factors such as organisational roles, relationships, past experiences, and interdependencies (Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2000, p. 35). Based on the principles of social exchange theory, it can be posited that individuals in the workforce tend to respond to the treatment they receive from their employing organisation by reciprocating in a manner that they believe to be equitable (Blau, 1964). Establishing a climate that promotes psychological safety within an organisation has been found to positively impact the quality of work produced and the extent of information shared among its members. This environment also facilitates the ability of individuals to overcome obstacles to innovation, such as the apprehension associated with potential failure (Edmondson, 1999, 2011; Andersson et al., 2020). This concept of trust relates to the team members' anticipation that the leader will be willing to acknowledge and value their viewpoints without harbouring any apprehension of facing retaliation or consequences from either the leader or other members (Schaubroeck et al., 2011). Consequently, a positive correlation exists between the trust team members place in their leader and their corresponding levels of psychological safety.

As a result, leaders can cultivate psychological safety within a team by establishing an appropriate climate, fostering the right mindsets, and promoting conducive behaviours. According to McKinsey (2021), effective leaders serve as catalysts by empowering and enabling other team members, including those without formal authority, to foster psychological safety. They achieve this by exemplifying and reinforcing the desired behaviours within the team. Leaders must establish a positive climate to foster a psychologically safe work environment, enhance employee well-being and engagement, and contribute to the overall success of organisations in Nigeria. This can be

achieved by promoting open communication, empowering employees, and exemplifying desired behaviours, particularly in light of the bureaucratic work culture in Nigeria.

Work design

Work design characteristics refer to the numerous elements and features that determine the structure and organisation of work in a particular job or environment. These characteristics affect how duties are carried out, the level of autonomy and decision-making authority granted to employees, and the overall work environment (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). The work design characteristics significantly influence individuals and teams in an organisation's psychological safety (Baer & Frey, 2003). Based on job characteristics theory (JCT), it can be inferred that work design characteristics substantially influence the psychological well-being of employees (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Therefore, it is anticipated that those characteristics will influence psychological safety by indicating that employees can make significant decisions (autonomy) and comprehend their role demands (known as role clarity). Furthermore, there is a positive correlation between interdependent work and psychological safety since it becomes increasingly imperative for employees to depend on one another to complete their assigned tasks (Edmondson, 1999). There is a growing interest in employees seeking autonomy to govern their work and make informed, uncoerced decisions in today's workplace. Autonomy is intertwined with the development processes of intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2006), instilling in employees a greater sense of responsibility and accountability and fostering autonomy (Wang & Peverly, 1986).

Teams with greater autonomy provide team members with the ability to independently oversee, strategise, delegate tasks, coordinate work schedules, make decisions about service or production, and promptly address any issues that may emerge. In addition, due to the high level of autonomy, team members have a sense of freedom in making daily decisions relating to the project without the need for external oversight (Stewart, 2006). Autonomous teams have been widely recognised as a crucial component of the future of work, especially with new, innovative, and flexible approaches to work. The rationale for dispersing learning and decision-making processes throughout teams is to decentralise these functions and mitigate potential bottlenecks that may impede their efficiency and effectiveness (Blomstrom, 2021). This approach is particularly relevant in our contemporary society, characterised by rapid change and technological advancements, where speed and performance are paramount.

Furthermore, Chandrasekaran and Mishra (2012) observed a positive correlation between increasing autonomy in teams and an increased perception of psychological safety among team members, leading to enhanced team performance. From the standpoint of job design, Frazier et al. (2017) found that interdependence significantly impacts psychological safety, as psychological safety is more likely to develop in work environments where employees must rely on one another to complete their tasks. Ade-Adeniji et al. (2021) observed that Nigerian organisations are characterised by bureaucracy, inflexible work hours, lack of work-life balance, lack of discretion to schedule work, and lack of freedom to make work decisions, limiting work and dynamic engagement and innovation. By considering work design characteristics, promoting autonomy, feedback, and learning opportunities, and fostering a culture that prioritises psychological safety, organisations in Nigeria can foster an environment where employees feel safe taking risks, speaking up, and contributing their unique insights to their overall effectiveness.

III. Conclusion

Psychological safety, an emerging concept in management and organisational psychology (Edmondson, 2019), is the bedrock of successful organisations in the 21st century's dynamic business environment. Psychological safety exists when employees feel they can voice ideas and concerns, seek assistance, admit mistakes, and question working methods and the ideas of others without fear of punishment or humiliation (Edmondson, 1999). Today's organisations are characterised by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA); psychological safety is essential for an organisation to have a better working environment where employees can express their opinions and challenge the status quo. Ude (1999) observed that organisational leadership in developing nations such as Nigeria has difficulty comprehending the art and science of leadership, which has posed a significant obstacle to the development, growth, and sustainability of small-scale enterprises. Communication from employees regarding problems, opportunities, and concerns is essential to an organisation's performance, and leaders require information from lower levels to make effective decisions and respond appropriately to dynamic organisational challenges to achieve organisational objectives. Therefore, for organisations in Nigeria to succeed in the global business market, their leadership must embrace the concept of psychological safety to overcome the prevalent culture of silence in business organisations.

Consequently, organisations in Nigeria can leverage psychological safety to create an innovative and high-performing work environment in this dynamic business environment. Therefore, organisations expediently need to take every affordable option(s) to weaken the weight of organisational silence in the workplace by embarking on ethical and inclusive leadership with the corporate ideology of help, cross-fertilisation of ideas, creativity, openness, and learning opportunities as a culture that projects prioritising psychological safety. Organisations should introduce policies on how management should receive and treat employees' opinions to reduce fear in the employees and make employees more engaged in organisational matters. Even when universal ideas and practises are used, cultural values in the larger society significantly impact organisational values. As a result, leadership must pay much attention to employee values, develop supportive and inclusive leadership competencies, create a positive organisational climate, promote high-quality relationships, and consider work design characteristics that promote autonomy, role clarity, and interdependence, thereby promoting psychological safety.

In today's exponentially changing business environment, the ability of corporate leaders to create a growth mindset in employees is the bedrock of innovation while ensuring that the organisational strategy, structure and culture are congruent. Every organisation's culture plays a significant role in whether the corporate leader can achieve a psychologically safe working environment, which is the hallmark of great enterprises in this 21st-century business environment that is dynamic, complex, ambiguous and technologically swift if an organisation can overcome its competitors. Though psychological safety is a new concept in Africa, the ability to imbibe it into an organisation's culture separates successful organisations from those struggling. This is because employees are free to make suggestions, try out new ideas, and put the organisation on the path of growth and success while keeping in mind that no leader will completely grasp their environment without the support of leaders, colleagues, and subordinates. Thereby agreeing with Anconda et al.'s (2007) assertion that a leader's role in contemporary society is not to command and control but to foster and coordinate the efforts of people across all levels of an organisation.

References

[1]. Aboud, K., Xiongying, N. &Qasim, M. (2023). Impact of Ethical Leadership on Employees' Psychological Safety and Voice Behavior; With Mediating Role of Belongingness. IJSAB International, vol. 20(1), pages 42-57.
[2]. Ade-Adeniji, O., Adeniji, A. & Imhonopi, D. (2021). Outcomes of job autonomy and its effect on work engagement: A study of the banking industry in Nigeria. Banks and Bank Systems, 16(3), 173-183.
[3]. Adeleye, I., Aja-Nwachukwu, F. & Fawehinmi, Y. (2012), "Managing diversity in Nigeria: the Chevron way", Human Resource Management Journal, Vol.4 No.1, pp. 1–13.
[4]. Agha, N. C., Nwekpa, K. C. & Eze, O. R. (2017). Impact of Ethical Leadership on Employee Commitment in Nigeria – A Study on Innoson Technical and Industrial Company Limited Enugu, Nigeria.
[5]. Amabile, T., Fisher, C. & Pillemer, J. (2014). IDEO's culture of helping. Harvard Business Review. 54-61.
[6]. Argyris, C, & Schoen, D. A. (1978). What is an organisation that it may learn? In Organisational learning: A theory perspective, Argyris C, Schoen DA (eds). Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA; 8–29.
[7]. Baer, M. & Frese, M. (2003), "Innovation is not enough: climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance", Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 45-68.
[8]. Bandura, A. (1977). Social teaming theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
[9]. Bashshur, M. R. & Oc, B. (2015). "When voice matters. A multilevel review of the impact of voice in organisations." Journal of Management 41/5, pp. 1530-1554.
[10]. Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. United States: Simon and Schuster.
[11]. Berquist, R., St-Pierre, I., & Holmes, D. (2018). Uncaring nurses: Mobilising power, knowledge, difference, and resistance to explain workplace violence in academia. Res. Theory Nursing Practices 32, 199-215.
[12]. Berscheid, E, & Ammazzalorso, H. (2003). Emotional experience in close relationships. In G. J. O. Fletcher, & M. S. Clark (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology: Interpersonal processes (pp. 308- 330). Oxford: Blackwell.
[13]. Blau, P.M. (1964) Justice in Social Exchange. Sociological Inquiry, 34, 193-206.
[14]. Blomstrom, D. (2021). The Future of High Performing Teams? Autonomy and Psychological Safety - PeopleNotTech.
[15]. Brown, R.B. & Brooks, I. (2002). Emotion at work: Identifying the emotional climate of night nursing. Journal of Management in Medicine, 16 (5), 327-344.

[16]. Brown, Steven & Leigh, Thomas. (1996). A New Look at Psychological Climate and Its Relationship to Job Involvement. The Journal of Applied Psychology. 81. 358-68. 10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.358.

[17]. Brown, M. E., and Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: a review and future directions. Leadersh. Q. 17, 595–616.

[18]. Brown, M.E., Trevino, L.K. and Harrison, D. (2005), "Ethical leadership: a social learning perspective for construct development and testing", Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 97 No. 2, pp. 117-134.

[19]. Bstieler, L., & Hemmert, M. (2010). Increasing learning and time efficiency in inter-organisational new product development teams. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 27, 485-499.

[20]. Burton, R. M., Lauridsen, J., & Obel, B. (2004). The impact of organisational climate and strategic fit on firm performance. *Human Resource Management*, **43**(1), 67– 82.

[21]. Carmeli, A. (2008). Top management team behavioural integration and the performance of service organisations. Group Organ. Manag. 2008, 33, 712–735.

[22]. Carmeli, A., Brueller, D. & Dutton, J. (2009). Learning Behaviours in the Workplace: The Role of High-quality Interpersonal Relationships and Psychological Safety. Systems Research and Behavioral Science. 26. 81 - 98. 10.1002/sres.932.

[23]. Carmeli, A.; Tishler, A.; Edmondson, A. (2012). CEO relational leadership and strategic decision quality in top management teams: The role of team trust and learning from failure. Strategic Organization, 10, 31–54.

[24]. Carmeli A, Reiter-Palmon R, Ziv E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. Creativity Research Journal, 22, 250–260. http://dx.doi. org/10.1080/10400419.2010.504654.

[25]. Chandrasekaran A., &Mishra A. (2012). Task design, team context, and psychological safety: An empirical analysis of R&D projects in high technology organisations. Production and Operations Management, 21(6), 977–996.

[26]. Chen, A. S. Y., & Hou, Y. H. (2016). The effects of ethical leadership, voice behaviour and climates for innovation on creativity: A moderated mediation examination. The Leadership Quarterly, 27(1), 1-13.

[27]. Crane, A. and Matten, D. (2007). Business Ethics. Managing Corporate Citizenship and Sustainability in the Age of Globalization, (2nd ed), New York, Oxford University Press Inc.

[28]. Crant, J. M. & Kim, T. Y. & Wang, J. (2011). Dispositional antecedents of demonstration and usefulness of voice behaviour. Journal of Business and Psychology. 26(3):285–97.

[29]. Crossan, M. M., & Apaydin, M. (2010). A Multi-Dimensional Framework of Organizational Innovation: A Systematic Review of the Literature. Journal of Management Studies, 47, 1154-1191.https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00880.x

[30]. Dania, O.R., & Inegbenebor, A. (2019). The types of fear experienced or prevalent in the Nigerian workplace. Accounting and Taxation Review, 3(3), 91-104

[31]. Dess, G. G. & Picken, J. C. (2000). Changing Roles: Leadership in the 21st Century. Organisational Dynamics, 28,18-34. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)88447-8.

[32]. Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behaviour and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(4), 869–884.

[33]. Dickson, M. W., BeShears, R. S. & Gupta, V. (2004). The impact of societal culture and industry on organisational culture. In: House, RJ, Hanges PJ, Javidan M, Dorfman, PW And Gupta, V, editors. Culture, leadership, and organisations: The GLOBE study of 62 Societies. London: Sage Publications.

[34]. Dutta, T., Meyerson, B., & Agley, J. (2018). "African cervical cancer prevention and control plans : A scoping review," J. Cancer Policy, vol. 16, no. May, pp. 73–81,

[35]. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behaviour in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44: 350-383.

[36]. Edmondson, A. (2004). Psychological Safety, Trust, and Learning in Organisations: A Group-Level Lens. In Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches; Kramer, R.M., Cook, K.S., Eds.; Russell Sage Foundation: New York, NY, USA; Volume 12, pp. 239–272.

[37]. Edmondson, A. (2019). The fearless organisation: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth, New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

[38]. Edmondson, A.C. (2002). The local and variegated nature of learning in organisations. Organization Science, 13(2), 128–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467- 6486.00386

[39]. 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(1), 23-43. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305.

[40]. Edmondson, A. C. & Mogelof, J. P. (2005). Explaining psychological safety in innovation teams: Organisational culture, team dynamics, or personality? In L. Thompson & H. Choi (Eds.), Creativity and innovation in organisational teams (pp. 109-136), Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[41]. Edmondson, A. C., Bohmer, R. M., & Pisano, G. P. (2001). Disrupted Routines: Team Learning and New Technology Implementation in Hospitals. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46(4), 685–716.

[42]. Eluwole, K. K. & Karatepe, O. & Avci, T. (2022). Ethical leadership, trust in organisation and their impacts on critical hotel employee outcomes. International Journal of Hospitality Management.

[43]. Engelbrecht, A. S., Heine, G., & Mahembe, B. (2017). Integrity, ethical leadership, trust and work engagement. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 38(3), 368-379.

[44]. Farghaly, S. & Abou Zeid, M. A. (2023). The relationship between toxic leadership and organisational performance: the mediating effect of nurses' silence. BMC Nursing. 22. 10.1186/s12912-022-01167-8.

[45]. Fast, N. J., Burris, E. R. & Bartel, C. A. (2014). Managing to stay in the dark: managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice. Acad Manag J.;57(4):1013–34.

[46]. Fisher, C. & Lovell, A. (2003). Business Ethics and Values, Pearson Education Limited, Essex.

[47]. 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. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183.

[48]. Frost, P. (2004). Handling Toxic Emotions: Organisational Dynamics. 33. 111–127. 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.01.001.

[49]. Gittell, J. H. (2003). The Southwest Airlines way: Using the power of relationships to achieve high performance. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[50]. Jerome, N. (2013) Application of the Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory; impacts and implications on organisational culture, human resource and employee's performance. International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 2(3) 39-45.

[51]. Joo, B.-K.(B)., Yoon, S.K. and Galbraith, D. (2021), "The effects of organisational trust and empowering leadership on group conflict: psychological safety as a mediator", Organization Management Journal, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 4-16.

[52]. Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1976) Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory. Organisational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 250-279.

[53]. Hans, S., & Gupta, R. (2018). Job characteristics affect shared leadership: The moderating effect of psychological safety and perceived self-efficacy. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 39(6), 730–744.

[54]. Hayes, P. & Prakasam, R. (1989). Culture: the efficacy of different modes of consultations. Leadership and Organisational Development Journal;10:24-32

[55]. Hirak, R., Peng, A. C., Carmeli, A. & Schaubroeck, J. M. (2012). Linking leader inclusiveness to work unit performance: The importance of psychological safety and learning from failures. Leadership Quarterly, 23, 107–117.

[56]. Hofstede, G. (2001), Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations, 2nd ed. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

[57]. Hofstede, G & Hofstede, GJ. (2005). Cultures and organisations - Software of the mind. Revised and expanded 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

[58]. Hunter, S. T., Bedell, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2005). Dimensions of creative climate: A general taxonomy. Korean Journal of Thinking and Problem Solving, 15, 97–116.

[59]. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33: 692–724.

[60]. Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the Effectiveness of Work Groups and Teams. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 7(3), 77–124. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00030.x

[61]. Lerner, J., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P. & Kassam, K. (2014). Emotion and Decision Making. Annual review of psychology. 66. 10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115043.

[62]. Losada, Marcial & Heaphy, Emily. (2004). The Role of Positivity and Connectivity in the Performance of Business TeamsA Nonlinear Dynamics Model. American Behavioral Scientist - AMER BEHAV SCI. 47. 740-765. 10.1177/0002764203260208.

[63]. Lewin, R & Regine, B. (2000). The Soul at Work. Simon & Schuster: New York.

[64]. Liu, W., Zhu, R., & Yang, Y. (2010). I warn you because I like you: Voice behaviour, employee identifications, and transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(1), 189–202.

[65]. Lu, Q., Song, J. W., and Xia, C. H. (2011). An analysis on the influencing mechanisms of ethical leadership: a social exchange perspective. Chin. J. Manag. 8, 1802–1812.

[66]. McLeod, S. (2007). Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. Simply Psychology, 1.

[67]. Marquette, H. (2012), 'Finding God' Or 'Moral Disengagement' In The Fight Against Corruption In Developing Countries? Evidence From India And Nigeria. Public Admin. Dev., 32: 11-26.

[68]. Manning, M. L., Davidson, M., & Manning, R. L. (2005). Measuring tourism and hospitality employee workplace perceptions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, **25**, 75–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2004.05.001

[69]. Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370–396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

[70]. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L. & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77, 11–37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892.

[71]. McWilliam, A. & Toner, F. (2021). Safe Space: How Psychological Safety Can Make Your Team More Effective. https://www.forbes.com/sites/googlecloud/2021/08/27/safe-space-how-psychological-safety-can-make-your-team-more-effective/?sh=5925a39942

[72]. Morrison, E. W. & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organisational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. The Academy of Management Review, 25(4), 706- 725. doi: 10.2307/259200

[73]. Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W. & Hewlin, P. E. (2003) An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees and why? Journal of management studies;40(6):1453-1476

[74]. Mogelof, J. P., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Explaining psychological safety in innovation teams: Organisational culture, team dynamics, or personality? In creativity and innovation in organisational teams (pp. 129–156). Psychology Press.

[75]. Mordi, C. & Oruh, E. (2017) A critical analysis of employee voice notion in Nigeria's petroleum industry; Proceedings of the 31st Annual Conference of the British Academy of Management; Warwick, UK. 5–7.

[76]. Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behaviour: Integration and directions for future research. *The Academy of Management Annals, 5*(1), 373–412.

[77]. Nembhard, I.M., & Edmondson A.C., (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27, 941–966. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job. 413

[78]. Newman, A.; Donohue, R.; Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. Human Resource Management Rev. 2017, 27, 521–535.

[79]. Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K, & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. Journal of Management; 36(4):827–56.

[80]. Parker, S. K. & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviours. Journal of Management;36(3):633–62.

[81]. Pfeffer, J. (1994). Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the workforce. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

[82]. Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Zhang, Y., & Samma, M. (2020). Sustainable work performance: The roles of workplace violence and occupational stress. International Journal Environmental Public Health, 17, 912.

[83]. Reiter-Palmon, R. & Millier, M. (2023). Psychological Safety and Creativity: The Glue That Binds a Creative Team. 10.1017/9781009031240.035.

[84]. Roussin, C. J., & Webber, S. S. (2012). Impact of organisational identification and psychological safety on initial perceptions of Coworker Trustworthiness. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*(3), 317–329. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9245-2

[85]. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-Regulation and the Problem of Human Autonomy: Does Psychology Need Choice, Self-Determination, and Will? Journal of Personality, 74, 1557-1586.

[86]. Sağnak, M. (2017). Ethical leadership and teachers' voice behaviour: The mediating roles of ethical culture and psychological safety. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* 17(4): 1101–1117.

[87]. Saunders, D.M., Sheppard, B.H., &Knight, V. (1992). Employee voice to supervisors. Employ Respons Rights J 5, 241–259.

[88]. Schein, E. H. (1985). Organisational culture and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[89]. Schein, E. H., &Bennis, W.(1965). Personal and Organisational Change via Group Methods. New York: Wiley.

[90]. Schaubroeck J, Lam SS, Peng AC. (2011). Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behaviour influences on team performance. J Appl Psychol. 2011 Jul;96(4):863-71. doi: 10.1037/a0022625. PMID: 21299271.

[91]. Schepers, J., de Jong, A., Wetzels, M., & de Ruyter, K. (2008). Psychological safety and social support in groupware adoption: A multi-level assessment in education. Computers & Education, 51(2), pp. 757-775.

[92]. Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K. and Cesaria, R. (1999). Measuring organisational trust: Trust and distrust across cultures. Paper funded by IABC Research Foundation.

[93]. Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K. and Winograd, G. (2000). Organisational trust: What it means and why it matters. Organizational Development Journal, 18(4), 35-48.

[94]. Society for Human Resource Management (2009), Global Diversity and Inclusion: Perceptions, Practices and Attitudes, SHRM, Alexandria, VA.

[95]. Søvold, L. E., Naslund, J. A, Kousoulis, A. A., Saxena, S., Qoronfleh, M. W., Grobler, C. & Münter, L. (2021). Prioritising the Mental Health and Well-Being of Healthcare Workers: An Urgent Global Public Health Priority. Front Public Health. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.679397. PMID: 34026720; PMCID: PMC8137852.

[96]. Stewart, G. L. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Review of Relationships Between Team Design Features and Team Performance. *Journal of Management, 32*(1), 29–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 0149206305277792

[97]. Tushman, M.L. and O'Reilly, C.A. (1996). The Ambidextrous Organizations: Managing Evolutionary and Revolutionary Change. California Management Review, 38, 8-30. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165852

[98]. Ude, O. K. (1999). Small Business Planning and Finance. Owerri, Apex ltd.

[99]. Umar, M. (2013). Antecedents and Outcomes of Voice and Silence Behaviours of Employees of Tertiary Educational Institutions in Nigeria. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 97. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.221.

[100]. Un, C. A. (2010). An empirical multi-level analysis for achieving balance between incremental and radical innovations. Journal of Engineering & Technology Management, 27(1), 1–19.

[101]. UNDP (2017). United Nations Development Programme Annual Report. Retrieved from htttp://www.ng.undp.org.

[102]. Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviours: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. Academy of Management Journal; 41(1):108–19.

[103]. Walumbwa, F. O., Cropanzano, R., & Goldman, B. M. (2011a). How leader-member exchange influences effective work behaviours: social exchange and internal-external efficacy perspectives. Pers. Psychol. 64, 739–770. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01224.x

[104]. Walumbwa, F. O., Mayer, D. M., Wang, P., Wang, H., Workman, K., & Christensen, A. L. (2011b). Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of leader–member exchange, self-efficacy, and organisational identification. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 115(2), 204–213

[105]. Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behaviour: mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(5), 1275.

[106]. Wanless, S. B. (2016) Bringing Psychological Safety to the Field of Human Development: An Introduction. Research in Human Development, 13:1, 1-5.

[107]. Wang, M. C., & Zollers, N. J. (1990). Adaptive Instruction: An Alternative Service Delivery Approach. Remedial and Special Education, 11(1), 7–21.

[108]. Wheelwright, S. C. (1994). Leading product development: The senior manager's guide to creating and shaping. United States: Simon and Schuster.

[109]. Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2020). What can be learned from growth mindset controversies? *American Psychologist, 75*(9), 1269–1284.

[110]. Yucel, I., McMillan, A., & Richard, O. C. (2014). "Does CEO transformational leadership influence top executive normative commitment?," J. Bus. Res., vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 1170–1177, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.05.005.

[111]. Zeng H, Zhao L and Zhao Y (2020) Inclusive Leadership and Taking-Charge Behavior: Roles of Psychological Safety and Thriving at Work. Front. Psychol. 11:62. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00062

[112]. Zhang, Z., & Wei, X. (2017). Superficial Harmony and Conflict Avoidance Resulting from Negative Anticipation in the Workplace. *Management and Organization Review, 13*(4), 795-820.

[113]. Zhu, W., He, H., Treviño, L. K., Chao, M. M., & Wang, W. (2015). Ethical leadership and follower voice and performance: The role of follower identifications and entity morality beliefs. The Leadership Quarterly, 26(5), 702–718.

[114]. Zhu, H. Khan, M. K. Nazeer, S. Li, L. Fu, Q. Badulescu, D & Badulescu, A. (2022). Employee Voice: A Mechanism to Harness Employees' Potential for Sustainable Success. Int J Environ Res Public Health; 19(2):921.