A concept analysis of psychological safety: Further understanding for application to health care
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Abstract
Aim: To clarify the concept of psychological safety in a healthcare context and to provide the first theoretical framework for improving interpersonal relationships in the workplace to better patient care.

Design: A Rodgers' concept analysis.

Methods: The concept analysis was conducted using a systematic search strategy on PubMed, CINAHL, PsycINFO and Ichushi-Web.

Results: An analysis of 88 articles studying psychological safety in health care identified five attributes: perceptions of the consequences of taking interpersonal risks, strong interpersonal relationships, group-level phenomenon, safe work environment for taking interpersonal risks and non-punitive culture. The antecedents included structure/system factors, interpersonal factors and individual factors. The four consequences included performance outcomes, organizational culture outcomes, and psychological and behavioural outcomes.
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1 | INTRODUCTION
Improving patient safety is a top priority in health care around the world (WHO, 2019). According to the World Health Organization (2019), providing an open and blame-free safety culture around incident reporting is crucial for maintaining patient safety. Meanwhile, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2017) advises that a focus on collective improvement and teamwork is also crucial for patient safety. Establishing a sense of psychological safety in the clinical environment fosters these elements, allowing nurses to more effectively ensure patient safety.

2 | BACKGROUND
The concept of psychological safety has been discussed across various disciplines and industries such as aviation, education and manufacturing. Common definitions of psychological safety include 'feeling able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career' (Kahn, 1990, p. 708) and 'a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking' (Edmondson, 1999, p. 354). This concept's application has spread to the healthcare discipline since it is known to yield positive healthcare outcomes. Recent studies in health care have demonstrated that psychological safety influences patient safety, interprofessional
collaboration, engagement in quality improvement work, learning from failures and reporting adverse events (Arnetz, Sudan, Goetz, Counts, & Arnetz et al., 2019; Greene et al., 2020; Hirak et al., 2012; O’Leary, 2016; Tucker et al., 2007). Thus, psychological safety is considered a critical factor to account for in projects that seek to better health care, including those interested in high-quality nursing, effective teamwork and patient safety.

Although research on psychological safety has increased in the healthcare field, its definition in this context remains unclear. A concept taken from other domains should be critically considered about its utility and importance in a new domain (Meleis, 2017). However, little research has discussed psychological safety in a theoretical sense. For example, one study has described psychological safety using the same concept as trust (Kang et al., 2020); others have described psychological safety as a speaking-up-related climate, part of justice culture, or feeling of safety around innovation (Appelbaum et al., 2018; Schwappach et al., 2018; Zuber & Moody, 2018). The lack of theoretical underpinning may hinder the advancement in healthcare management in terms of ensuring a conducive environment for high-quality care. Furthermore, few specific tools measure psychological safety in a healthcare context (O’Donovan et al., 2020). For example, Edmondson (1999) developed a scale to measure psychological safety in a general context including health care; meanwhile, Richard et al. (2017) developed a questionnaire measuring aspects such as psychological safety that influence speaking-up behaviour among healthcare staff about patient safety concerns. Nonetheless, the lack of statistically rigorous measurements of psychological safety, specifically in the context of health care (O’Donovan et al., 2020), prevents the exploration of its antecedents and implications for healthcare management.

2.1 | Research question

A concept analysis can clarify the structures of a concept and its relationships to other concepts. It also highlights implications for future scale development and clinical practices. Rodgers (2000) developed a concept analysis approach to describe a concept that changes in a context, allowing for its development and further research. Thus, this study aimed to identify the concept of psychological safety in a healthcare context through a Rodgers’ concept analysis and provide the first theoretical foundations for how such an understanding may better interpersonal relationships and patient care. Therefore, our research question was What are the attributes, antecedents and consequences of psychological safety in the context of health care?

3 | THE STUDY

3.1 | Design

This study used Rodgers’ evolutionary approach. Rodgers’ approach aims to capture changing and evolving concepts over time and develop a concept for further research and clinical practice. It includes the following six steps to analyse a concept: (1) identifying the concept of interest and associated expressions; (2) identifying and selecting an appropriate realm (setting and sample) for data collection; (3) collecting data relevant to identify the attributes of the concept, the antecedents, consequences and related concepts; (4) analysing the data in terms of the above characteristics of the concept; (5) identifying an exemplar of the concept, if appropriate; and (6) identifying implications, hypotheses and implications for further development of the concept (Rodgers, 2000, p.85).

3.2 | Method

This concept analysis was conducted using a systematic search strategy on PubMed, CINAHL, PsycINFO and Ichushi-Web, with no publication date limitation. Keywords used were as follows: "psychological safety [AB]" was used in PubMed, CINAHL and Ichushi-Web; "psychological safety [AB]" AND (health care OR doctor OR physician OR nurs* OR hospital OR medic*) were used in PsycINFO. This study was undertaken in April 2020.

The search yielded 300 articles after removing duplicates. Articles that met the following inclusion criteria were selected: (1) focused on concepts of psychological safety, (2) conducted in health care, (3) employees completed a survey, (4) were not literature review articles, (5)
was an empirical study, (6) not duplicated among databases and (7) other reasons, such as written in English and Japanese and availability of the full text. Two reviewers scanned the titles and abstracts of the articles. As shown in Figure 1, this procedure excluded 134 articles. Additionally, 78 articles were excluded through the full-text scanning by the reviewers. Finally, this systematic strategy led to 88 articles. The PRISMA guideline was used for this concept analysis.

3.3 Analysis

As described by Rodgers (2000), a thematic analysis was conducted to identify the concept, and descriptions of attributes, antecedents and consequences were selected from each article. According to Rodgers’ approach, attributes constitute a real definition, an antecedent is a phenomenon before an instance of the concept, and a consequence is a result of the concept (Rodgers, 2000). The findings from the articles were put into the matrix sheet. Subsequently, they were categorized and organized the descriptions according to their similarities and trends. Finally, we again grouped the categories made to increase the level of abstraction. This analysis process was repeated until four researchers agreed on the whole process of categorizations and abstractions.

3.4 Ethics

We declare no conflicts of interest associated with this manuscript. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI, Grant Number JP19H03920. Furthermore, this concept analysis was not needed the Research Ethics Committee approval and the patient consent because our study analysed only published articles.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Overview of contexts and results

Table A1 in the Appendix lists the 88 articles analysed in this study. Of these 88 articles, 60 were published between 2016 and 2020. Fifty-one articles cited definitions of psychological safety by Edmondson (1999). Fifty-eight articles used instruments to measure psychological safety, of which 35 (60.3%) used self-report measurements developed by Edmondson (1999). Additionally, 47 of the included articles were studies conducted in Northern America (United States: \( n = 47 \); Canada: \( n = 1 \)), 26 in Europe (Western: \( n = 16 \); Northern: \( n = 9 \); Southern: \( n = 1 \)) and 8 in Asia (Western: \( n = 4 \); Eastern: \( n = 2 \); Southeastern: \( n = 1 \); and Southern: \( n = 1 \)).

This concept analysis identified five attributes, three antecedents and four consequences. Figure 2 illustrates the conceptual model of psychological safety in the healthcare context based on the findings of this analysis.

4.2 Attributes

4.2.1 Perceptions of the consequences of taking interpersonal risks

The concept analysis found that psychological safety captured perceptions of the consequences of interpersonal risk behaviours in the work environment. Interpersonal risk behaviour has often caused team members to be labelled ignorant, incompetent and disturbers in work environments, including behaviours such as asking questions, reporting errors and bringing up concerns (Edmondson, 2019). For example, MacCurtain et al. (2018) described psychological safety as...
when employees feel safe voicing concerns and reporting problems and can trust their supervisor.

4.2.2 | Strong interpersonal relationships

This attribute included a description of strong interpersonal relationships, such as trust and respect. For example, Albritton et al. (2019) described that a high level of psychological safety reflected a team climate of interpersonal trust and mutual respect.

4.2.3 | Group-level phenomenon

This attribute suggested that psychological safety was a group-level phenomenon, although the first and second themes described psychological safety as an individual-level concept, including individuals’ perceptions and feelings. Lee, Yang, and Chen (2016) described psychological safety as a shared belief among groups that facilitated the acceptability of behavioural risks.

4.2.4 | Safe work environment for taking interpersonal risks

The concept analysis found that psychological safety concerns in the work environment were linked to interpersonal risk behaviours. Noah and Steve (2012) stated that the organizational work environment includes systems, procedures, practices, values and philosophies. Singer et al. (2015) identified psychological safety as a cultivated environment safe for interpersonal risk-taking. Based on the definition of the work environment, the concept of psychological safety concerns the structure dimension in an organization that facilitates interpersonal risk.

4.2.5 | Non-punitive culture

Psychological safety was recognized as an organizational culture where team members were not punished or blamed even if they took interpersonal risks. According to previous studies, organizational culture is a wider concept than that of the work environment described in the previous category in this paper. Alaire and Firsirou (1984) argued that organizational culture comprises three components: the structure of an organization; a cultural system including an organization’s myths, ideology and values; and individual factors including employees’ experiences, personalities and cognitions. Lee et al. (2016) stated that teams possessed a common belief and a non-punitive culture that accepted the risk of reporting behaviours when team members perceived psychological safety.

4.3 | Antecedents

4.3.1 | The structure/system factor

This theme included policy and procedures, fairness, organizational support and a specific management style. As an example of management style, Halbesleben and Rathert (2008) reported that an improvement orientation management style was a predictor of psychological safety.

4.3.2 | Interpersonal factors

Interpersonal factors were identified as antecedents of psychological safety, including trust, respect, effective relationships, support, high-quality communication and leader behaviour. Effective relationships involved interpersonal relationships among work teams, such as collegial teamwork and familiarity in the team. This analysis distinguishes support in this theme from organizational support described in the previous category. Support in this theme is particularly concerned with interpersonal support among team members in a work environment. Examples include support from leaders, team members and peers.

Additionally, high-quality communication fosters psychological safety. High-quality communication for psychological safety has the following features: frequent, open and honest communication.

Furthermore, this analysis found that leader behaviour was a prerequisite for psychological safety. Leader behaviour as an antecedent comprises leadership, inclusiveness, behavioural integrity and acknowledging employees’ fallibility. Various types of leadership were positively related to psychological safety, although there were mixed results among the selected articles. For instance, transformational leadership predicted psychological safety (Raes et al., 2013). A leader’s inclusiveness, described as a leader’s words and deeds that invite and appreciate others’ contributions (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006), facilitated psychological safety. Furthermore, behavioural integrity, defined as the perception of alignment between a leader’s words and deeds (Simons, 2002), promoted psychological safety.

4.3.3 | Individual factors

Individual factors included demographic characteristics, status differences and employees’ behaviours and skills.

Demographic characteristics were associated with psychological safety. For example, age was negatively related to psychological safety (Buljac-Samardžić et al., 2018). Moreover, minorities perceive lower psychological safety than that of white employees (Derickson et al., 2015). Differences in status levels also influenced psychological safety. This analysis identified two types of status differences
as antecedents. First, there were status differences in disciplines; for example, residents generally had lower status than physicians. Residents’ perceptions of power distance were related to psychological safety (Appelbaum et al., 2016). Second, status differences among disciplines were also antecedents. For instance, about psychological safety, physicians felt more than nurses, and nurses felt more than respiratory therapists in a neonatal intensive care unit (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006).

Finally, employee behaviours and skills were identified as antecedents. Less incivility and more self-forgiveness skills were associated with greater feelings of psychological safety.

4.4 | Consequences

4.4.1 | Performance outcomes

Psychological safety influenced safety culture in a team and quality of care, including patient safety, effective rescue, patient-centred care, patient satisfaction and transition to professional practice.

4.4.2 | Organizational culture outcomes

This theme of consequences included dimensions of interpersonal relationships and the culture/work environment. The analysis revealed that psychological safety facilitated interpersonal relationships such as interprofessional collaboration, teamwork and trust. Additionally, psychological safety influenced the dimensions of culture and work environment in a healthcare organization. Creativity, transparency and innovation appeared in work environments with high psychological safety. Furthermore, psychological safety created a climate of organizational learning.

4.4.3 | Psychological outcomes

Psychological safety influenced healthcare providers’ psychological outcomes. Specifically, psychological safety enhanced job satisfaction, work engagement, organizational commitment and empowerment and led to less emotional exhaustion and stress. Additionally, psychological safety encouraged healthcare providers to engage in quality improvement work.

4.4.4 | Behavioural outcomes

Finally, this analysis identified the dimensions of healthcare workers’ behavioural outcomes as consequences of psychological safety.

A high level of psychological safety allows healthcare workers to engage in interpersonal risk behaviours. Interpersonal risk behaviours include learning behaviour, speaking-up behaviour, giving and seeking feedback, error-seeking behaviour, extra-role behaviour and implementation of new practices. Learning behaviour allows a team to obtain and process data that facilitates a team to adapt and improve (Edmondson, 1999). Furthermore, psychological safety engendered speaking-up behaviour. Speaking-up behaviour was referred to as an open statement of views or opinions about workplace matters (Premeaux & Bedeian, 2003). Specifically, reporting errors, suggesting ideas, bringing up concerns, asking questions, asking for help and sharing knowledge were identified as positive outcomes of psychological safety in health care.

Furthermore, high-quality communication was built when healthcare providers felt psychological safety. In contrast, lack of psychological safety was associated with negative behaviours. For instance, the absence of psychological safety increased oppressive behaviour, disruptive behaviour, workarounds and bullying.

4.5 | Model case

A new graduate nurse makes a mistake. At first, she/he is afraid to report the mistake, but the fear eventually disappears.

The psychologically safe unit allows the graduate nurse to report the mistake to the nurse manager. The unit has a policy of fostering a culture that does not punish others for reporting errors. The manager in the unit has implemented this policy by her/his words and deeds to keep her/his integrity. Moreover, the new graduate nurses have received support from other nurses in the unit. The policy and supportive relationships help the new nurses feel safe in reporting errors in the unit. In addition, the unit with high psychological safety influences their psychological and performance dimension. The new graduate nurses could engage in their work in the psychologically safe unit and transition successfully into professional practice.

This exemplar demonstrates the attributes, antecedents and consequences of psychological safety in a healthcare team, with a high level of it identified in this concept analysis. It can help nurse managers and researchers understand the concept of psychological safety in a clinical situation.

5 | DISCUSSION

Our concept analysis identified the attributes, antecedents and consequences of psychological safety in a healthcare context. The concept of psychological safety is a multilevel phenomenon related to a unit culture that facilitates interpersonal risk behaviour. This study demonstrated that psychological safety in a healthcare work environment influenced proactive behaviours, such as asking questions, reporting errors and communicating openly. Additionally, psychological safety proved to be associated with strong interpersonal relationships and an effective culture that includes collaboration, trust and innovation, which ensure patient safety.

Many of the included articles were published in the past five years, suggesting that the concept of psychological safety in healthcare is still developing. More than half of the articles cited the
definition or measurement developed by Edmondson (1999). This finding suggests that Edmondson’s work has been instrumental in stimulating research on psychological safety in the healthcare field. Mounting research has yielded attributes of psychological safety that are unique to health care and demonstrated that antecedents and consequences reflect the context (in this case, health care).

We found five themes related to attributes. The theme of a group-level phenomenon was considered an attribute specific to health care. This is in line with a previous study comparing the characteristics of healthcare and educational settings (Edmondson et al., 2016), which concluded that psychological safety as a group phenomenon was unique to the healthcare environment. In the educational context, differences in the perception of psychological safety existed between elementary and high schools. Centrally, in the healthcare context, differences in perception exist in a hospital; that is, there were differences between units, such as between surgical and medical units.

However, this analysis identified psychological safety as an individual-level phenomenon, including themes of the perception of interpersonal risk and strong interpersonal relationships. Therefore, our findings suggest that psychological safety has both group and individual dimensions. We considered this finding to be complementary rather than contradictory. The theory of organizational culture (Allaire & Firsiru, 1984) explains this complex characteristic of psychological safety. According to this theory, organizational culture consists of interpretations of what members experience in the group; in other words, a feeling of psychological safety among members is a prerequisite for building a culture of psychological safety in teams.

We also identified three antecedent themes (structure/system factors, interpersonal factors and individual factors). Specifically, the findings suggest that the theme of status differences was a unique antecedent in the healthcare context. A systematic review (Newman et al., 2017) analysing articles without limitations on disciplines had similarly identified status differences as an antecedent. Notably, this study found two types of status differences in the context of health care—in a discipline and among disciplines. Moreover, our findings indicated that, to establish psychological safety in healthcare organizations, it is necessary to reduce status gaps both in and among disciplines.

Four themes were identified as consequences of psychological safety. The theme of implementing new practices reflected the contextual characteristics of health care. As diseases and evidence-based care evolve and new equipment and skills are periodically developed, healthcare providers must constantly try to implement new practices. Therefore, our results suggested that additional studies to examine the relationship between psychological safety and implementation of new practices are necessary to promote high performance in the healthcare environment. Furthermore, we found complex themes that were identified as both antecedents and consequences, including trust, interpersonal support and high-quality communication. This finding implied that some of the antecedents and consequences of psychological safety influenced each other.

Our concept analysis has implications for further research. First, we recommend that further research develop a measurement including specific items that reflect the context of health care. Many of the selected articles used the measurement developed by Edmondson (1999). This measurement captures psychological safety in the general context and is composed of a single factor. An additional measurement that captures psychological safety in the context of health care reflecting the attributes found in this study is needed to obtain detailed suggestions for nursing managers. Therefore, the themes of attributes, antecedents and consequences in this analysis may help develop a new measurement tool. New measurements could also facilitate empirical studies that would establish a team culture of psychological safety.

Second, we recommend examining whether psychological safety is affected by national culture. Only a few articles conducted in Eastern cultures were selected, although this analysis used both English and Japanese databases. Newman et al. (2017) stated that national culture influences psychological safety. For instance, team members in a work environment in Western cultures perceive more psychological safety than those in Eastern cultures, as Western cultures are generally characterized by a low level of collectivism; thus, speaking-up behaviour is considered to have minimal social cost. However, previous studies concluded that little is known about how psychological safety is influenced by differences in culture (Newman et al., 2017). Therefore, additional research in the healthcare field needs to be conducted in various countries to clarify cultural influences.

5.1 | Limitations

Two limitations to this concept analysis were identified. First, the inclusion criteria for articles may have resulted in bias: This analysis included articles that referred to ‘psychological safety’ in the abstract; moreover, we excluded grey literature or articles written in languages other than English and Japanese. Therefore, we could have missed relevant articles. Second, this analysis used the search term “psychological safety,” which may have caused us to miss articles that expressed “psychological safety” using different terms. However, to minimize bias, we checked the surrogate terms of psychological safety and discussed the validity of the search term before conducting the search strategy.

5.2 | Conclusion

This study demonstrated that psychological safety in a healthcare work environment influences proactive behaviours such as asking questions, reporting errors and open communication. Additionally, psychological safety is associated with strong interpersonal relationships and an effective culture that includes collaboration, trust and innovation, which ensure patient safety.

In clinical environments, nurse managers serve an important role in cultivating a constructive work environment. Nurse managers’
roles include improving quality and performance and encouraging collaboration among interprofessional staff and nurses. Our findings offer insights to help nurse managers enhance psychological safety in the workplace. First, nurse managers can build a unit with psychological safety through a set of procedures while adopting consistency, bias-suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness and ethicality rules (Leventhal, 1980). Nurse managers consider these rules when making decisions, which allows them to achieve high-quality care through psychological safety.

Second, nurse managers can build interpersonal relationships with high psychological safety through leadership behaviours consisting of inclusiveness and/or high-quality communication. Specially, we recommend that nurse managers encourage staff nurses’ contributions to their unit and openly and frequently communicate with nurses and interprofessional staff. Nurse managers can use these behaviours to establish psychologically safe relationships that allow staff nurses to ask questions and provide better care with interprofessional collaboration.
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