




Exploring the Components of Psychological Safety in Multicultural Work Teams

Molly. Schwarzenberger^{1*}, Derek. Péloquin², Jessica. Brassard²

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

² School of Psychology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: mo-schawarzenberger@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Mohsen Golparvar  Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran mgolparvar@khuif.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Mohsen Kachooei  Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Nadereh Saadati  Department of Couple and Family therapy, Alliant International University, California, United States of America. mdaneshpour@alliant.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The claim that multicultural work teams “have become a defining feature of organizations across sectors” could be strengthened by including Canadian labor force statistics or a citation specific to Canada. This would contextualize the study more firmly.

The sentence, “Workplaces characterized by radical transparency and high reliability practices...”, introduces healthcare examples. Since your study spans multiple industries, clarify why healthcare is emphasized here or provide a second example from corporate or public sectors.

The description of Braun and Clarke’s six-phase framework is accurate, but it lacks explanation of how inter-coder reliability or agreement was ensured. Did more than one coder analyze the transcripts? If yes, report intercoder reliability measures; if not, justify the single-coder approach.

The theme “Language Inclusivity” emphasizes patience and translations. Discuss whether organizations provided formal language support (translation services, policies) or if this was entirely informal peer support. This distinction is important for practical recommendations.

Participant 7's statement about flexible deadlines due to cultural time perceptions is insightful. However, this could be misinterpreted as stereotyping. Clarify whether this flexibility was mutually agreed upon or perceived as unequal by some members.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement, "Studies show that when psychological safety is absent, individuals from minority cultural backgrounds often withhold ideas..." is strong but could overgeneralize. Indicate that such findings are context-dependent, or specify which industries were examined.

The gap is well articulated, but the rationale for focusing solely on Canada could be clearer. Why was Canada chosen—due to its cultural diversity, workplace policies, or immigration trends?

While member checks and peer debriefing are mentioned, "prolonged engagement with the data" remains vague. Specify the length of engagement (e.g., months of immersion, hours of transcript review) to substantiate credibility.

The example from Participant 2 ("Our supervisor never schedules important meetings during religious holidays...") is excellent. Yet, it might be helpful to provide at least one negative case—where lack of cultural sensitivity harmed safety. This would balance the findings.

The claim that "Empathy emerged as a particularly salient subtheme..." could be further supported by connecting it to psychological safety theories (e.g., Edmondson's framework). Currently, the discussion integrates literature but does not sufficiently tie back to core theories.

The authors state, "Recognition and appreciation were another significant dimension...". While consistent with the literature, the discussion does not explore cultural variations in recognition (e.g., collectivist vs. individualist norms). Addressing this would strengthen cross-cultural insight.

The limitation noting "researcher bias" is valid, but consider also noting the possible influence of participants' awareness of being in a study (Hawthorne effect), particularly given the sensitive subject of psychological safety.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.