

Toxic Work Environment and Psychological Distress in Indonesian Multisector Companies: A Narrative Review Through the Lens of Psychological Safety Theory (2024–2026)

Anang Setiawan*

Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia
Email: * anang.setiawan@unm.ac.id

Received : 12 May 2026

Accepted : 21 May 2026

Published online : 09 June 2026

Abstract

Toxic work environments remain a persistent organizational problem in Indonesia, particularly in sectors characterized by high emotional labor, close supervision, heavy customer interaction, and strong performance pressure. This narrative review examines whether the relationship between toxic work environment and psychological distress is a sufficiently recurrent phenomenon in Indonesian multisector organizations during 2024–2026, and whether Psychological Safety Theory provides an adequate explanation for that relationship. Using a purposive narrative review approach, the article synthesizes open-access evidence from Indonesian empirical studies and reviews published in 2024–2026 across contact center, manufacturing, education, and mixed-sector organizational settings. The reviewed literature consistently depicts toxic work environments as settings marked by poor communication, lack of support, interpersonal conflict, bullying, discrimination, unfairness, and psychologically unsafe leadership. Across the reviewed studies, toxic work conditions are associated with elevated work stress, anxiety, emotional exhaustion, depressive symptoms, reduced performance, and withdrawal cognition. The review finds that the toxic environment–distress link appears repeatedly across sectors rather than as an isolated sector-specific anomaly. Psychological Safety Theory explains this pattern by emphasizing that employees who do not feel safe to speak up, admit mistakes, ask for help, or express concerns allocate more cognitive and emotional energy to self-protection than to task performance. In such contexts, informal social control mechanisms—such as fear, blame, silence, and exclusion—amplify distress. The review concludes that, in Indonesia, Psychological Safety Theory remains a useful and empirically plausible lens for explaining how toxic work environments contribute to psychological distress, although current evidence is still fragmented and often uses distress proxies such as work stress, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion. The article identifies research gaps and proposes directions for future empirical studies using multi-sector samples, longitudinal designs, and direct measurement of psychological safety and psychological distress.

Keywords: toxic work environment; psychological distress; psychological safety; Indonesia; narrative review; social control; multisector organizations

1. Introduction

The quality of the work environment has become a central concern in organizational behavior, human resource management, and occupational health psychology. In contemporary organizations, the workplace is not only a site of production but also a social



arena in which employees continuously negotiate status, belonging, voice, performance expectations, and emotional demands. When these interactions are constructive, employees typically experience support, trust, and learning. When they are destructive, the workplace becomes toxic: communication deteriorates, fear increases, informal sanctions multiply, and workers begin to experience psychological strain that can impair both well-being and performance.

In the Indonesian context, the issue has gained renewed attention during 2024–2026 because toxic work conditions are increasingly discussed not merely as interpersonal problems but as organizational risks that affect retention, productivity, service quality, and mental health. The available open-access evidence suggests that toxic work environments are present in multiple sectors, including contact centers, manufacturing, and education. In a 2025 study of contact center employees in Central Java and Yogyakarta, the authors reported that around 42% of workers experienced an unhealthy work atmosphere characterized by poor communication and lack of support, while the same study also noted a 35% rise in stress levels in the service sector over the previous two years (Prasetyo et al., 2025). In a manufacturing setting in Ambon, a toxic work environment was found to have a positive and significant effect on employee work stress (Siahaya et al., 2026). In a qualitative study of employees in Medan, toxic work culture was reported to contribute to increased work stress, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion (Sinaga, 2026). In an educational context, toxic workplace culture was also described as a factor that exacerbates psychological distress among teachers (Makhmanazarova et al., 2026). A 2024 systematic review further concluded that toxic workplace environments significantly increase job stress and reduce employee life satisfaction and productivity (Sari & Dudija, 2024).

Even though these studies do not represent the entire nation, they are significant as they suggest that the toxic workplace issue is not limited to a single organization or a specific occupational group. Instead, it seems to manifest in various organizational structures and work environments. This is significant for theory as Psychological Safety Theory suggests that employees excel and learn most effectively when they view interpersonal risk as minimal. In the absence of that feeling of safety, employees turn defensive, quiet, and uneasy, leading to heightened distress (Edmondson, 1999). The issue at hand is not just if harmful work environments pose risks, but whether the concept of psychological safety continues to be a relevant explanatory model for Indonesian organizations in 2026.

This review tackles three interconnected questions. Initially, does the existing literature from 2024 to 2026 suggest that toxic work environments and psychological distress are persistent issues within Indonesian multisector organizations? Secondly, in what ways do these studies both conceptually and empirically link workplace toxicity to psychological distress? Third, can Psychological Safety Theory sufficiently clarify this relationship within the Indonesian context? The response to these inquiries holds both theoretical and practical importance. Theoretically, it investigates if psychological safety is simply a broad Western idea or a relevant empirical framework for Indonesian organizational culture. It advises organizations aiming to alleviate stress, enhance voice behavior, and boost employee well-being by fostering more supportive cultures.

The article uses a narrative review approach instead of a systematic review or meta-analysis. This selection is suitable as the existing Indonesian evidence is scattered across various journals, sectors, and methodological approaches. A narrative review enables the integration of diverse results, the recognition of shared concepts, and the development of theory-based interpretations. The review, consequently, does not assert statistical

generalization. Rather, it provides a critical integration of the existing evidence and assesses the viability of Psychological Safety Theory as a framework for explanation.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Toxic Work Environment

The term toxic work environment is commonly used to describe a workplace climate in which harmful interpersonal behaviors, unfair practices, and chronic stressors become normalized. In the literature reviewed here, toxicity is associated with poor communication, lack of support from supervisors or peers, interpersonal conflict, bullying, discrimination, unfairness, and emotionally hostile interaction patterns (Prasetyo et al., 2025; Siahaya et al., 2026; Sinaga, 2026). Toxicity does not require overt aggression alone. It can also emerge through subtle forms of degradation, such as chronic dismissiveness, exclusion, microaggressions, or the systematic invalidation of employee voice.

The key feature of a toxic work environment is persistence. One-off conflict is not enough to define a workplace as toxic. Rather, toxicity becomes salient when harmful patterns repeat over time and shape the employee's general expectation that the workplace is unsafe, unfair, or psychologically exhausting. In this sense, toxic work environments may be understood as structural and relational conditions that produce cumulative harm.

2.2. Psychological Distress

Psychological distress indicates a condition of emotional pain that can encompass anxiety, symptoms of depression, ongoing stress, emotional fatigue, feelings of helplessness, irritability, and diminished psychological performance. In workplace environments, psychological distress commonly manifests as work-related stress, burnout, anxiety, fear, and emotional exhaustion. The Indonesian studies examined in this review frequently utilize these immediate constructs instead of a unified standardized distress index, yet they conceptually indicate the same area of mental pressure.

In the contact center study, toxic workplace conditions were associated with greater job stress and mental health risks such as anxiety and depression (Prasetyo et al., 2025). In Medan, toxic work culture was linked to stress, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion (Sinaga, 2026). In the teacher-focused study, toxic workplace culture was said to significantly exacerbate psychological distress (Makhmanazarova et al., 2026). These patterns indicate that psychological distress is not an abstract issue in Indonesian organizations; it is an observable response to hostile or unsafe organizational climates

2.3. Psychological Safety

Psychological Safety Theory is the central lens of this review. Edmondson (1999) defined psychological safety as a shared belief that a team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking. This means employees feel able to ask questions, admit mistakes, request help, and express concerns without fear of humiliation, punishment, or retaliation. Psychological safety is not the absence of accountability; rather, it is the presence of a climate in which learning and speaking up are possible without personal threat.

Edmondson's original study showed that psychological safety is associated with learning behavior and that learning behavior mediates the relationship between psychological safety and team performance (Edmondson, 1999). The core insight is that people are less likely to engage in adaptive behavior when they fear social consequences. In unsafe environments, they conserve themselves rather than contribute openly. This idea is directly relevant to toxic workplaces, where employees often become quiet, defensive, and emotionally constrained.

2.4. Social Control as a Complementary Lens

Although the article is anchored in Psychological Safety Theory, social control processes are also relevant. Toxic workplaces often operate through informal social control: fear of punishment, blame, ridicule, exclusion, surveillance, and reputational threat. These mechanisms regulate behavior by discouraging dissent and reinforcing conformity. Employees learn which behaviors are risky, which voices are welcome, and which mistakes will be punished. Over time, this control structure reduces autonomy and intensifies distress.

In this sense, psychological safety and social control are closely related. Psychological safety describes the positive condition in which interpersonal risk is tolerable. Social control describes the negative condition in which risk is managed through coercive or exclusionary mechanisms. Toxic workplaces tend to suppress psychological safety by relying on control systems that generate silence rather than trust.

2.5. Theoretical Framework: Psychological Safety Theory and Toxicity–Distress Linkage

Psychological Safety Theory offers a compelling explanation linking toxic work environments to psychological distress. The reasoning is simple. In a psychologically secure setting, workers can voice their thoughts, ask for assistance, seek clarification, and err while acquiring knowledge. In a harmful setting, these actions turn perilous as workers anticipate unfavorable responses. When the work environment is viewed as hazardous, employees start to self-censor, regulate their speech, and expect social repercussions. This depletes mental resources and causes emotional stress.

Edmondson's theory is particularly valuable as it focuses on organizational climate rather than individual shortcomings. Psychological distress cannot be solely attributed to a lack of personal resilience. Rather, distress is regarded as a result of the relational environment in which work takes place. This is particularly significant in Indonesia, where hierarchical structures, power distance, and strong respect norms can render employees especially vulnerable to interpersonal threats. A toxic work environment can be perceived not just as uncomfortable but also as psychologically harmful.

The 2024–2026 Indonesian evidence aligns with this theoretical logic. The contact center study described an unhealthy atmosphere with poor communication and lack of support, conditions that are likely to reduce interpersonal risk-taking (Prasetyo et al., 2025). The manufacturing study in Ambon found that a toxic environment significantly increased work stress, suggesting that the psychological burden of the setting exceeded workers' adaptive capacity (Siahaya et al., 2026). The Medan qualitative study reported stress, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion, which are consistent with a low-safety climate in which employees feel unable to regulate interpersonal threat effectively (Sinaga, 2026). The teacher study explicitly noted that toxic workplace culture can exacerbate psychological distress and that supportive and psychologically safe environments are needed to protect well-being (Makhmanazarova et al., 2026).

The theory similarly clarifies why distress can arise even when formal workloads are not particularly heavy. In harmful environments, the primary stressor is not just task requirements but also interpersonal danger. Employees might invest a significant portion of their effort in steering clear of disputes, safeguarding their image, and foreseeing responsibility. This explains why distress may continue despite organizations implementing surface-level wellness initiatives. If psychological safety stays low, the fundamental relational danger is not addressed.

3. Methods

This article uses a narrative review design. Narrative review is appropriate when the literature is conceptually rich, methodologically heterogeneous, and distributed across sectors and publication outlets. The aim is not to calculate pooled effect sizes but to synthesize themes and evaluate theoretical plausibility.

3.1. Search Orientation and Scope

The review prioritizes open-access studies published during 2024–2026 and relevant to Indonesian organizational settings. The sectoral focus is multisectoral: contact center/service, manufacturing, education, and mixed organizational contexts. Sources were prioritized when they met at least three of the following criteria: (1) open access, (2) empirical or review-based evidence, (3) Indonesian context, (4) clear relevance to toxic work environment or psychological distress, and (5) publication within the target period.

3.2. Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included when they: (a) discussed toxic work environment, toxic work culture, workplace hostility, or closely related constructs; (b) reported outcomes such as psychological distress, work stress, anxiety, emotional exhaustion, burnout, or mental health strain; (c) focused on Indonesian organizations or Indonesian workers; and (d) were accessible in open form. The review also included one foundational theory source, Edmondson (1999), because the article is explicitly framed by Psychological Safety Theory.

3.3. Exclusion Criteria

Studies were excluded when they: (a) were not accessible as full text or open-access materials; (b) lacked Indonesian organizational relevance; (c) dealt with toxicity only in a metaphorical or unrelated sense; or (d) focused on outcomes unrelated to employee distress and well-being.

3.4. Synthesis Procedure

The selected studies were grouped by sector and then compared thematically. The synthesis emphasized three questions: (1) What counts as toxic work environment in the reviewed studies? (2) What psychological outcomes are repeatedly reported? (3) Does the pattern support the explanatory assumptions of Psychological Safety Theory? The final synthesis therefore integrates empirical findings with theory-driven interpretation.

4. Findings from the 2024–2026 Literature

4.1. Evidence from the Contact Center and Service Sector

The contact center sector is one of the clearest contexts in which toxic work environment and psychological strain appear together. In the 2025 predictive model study of contact center workers in Central Java and Yogyakarta, the authors reported that 42% of workers experienced an unhealthy work atmosphere marked by poor communication and lack of support, while stress levels in the service sector had increased by 35% over the preceding two years (Prasetyo et al., 2025). The study also notes that employees in toxic environments face lower job satisfaction and increased risk of anxiety and depression.

This sector is important because contact centers often combine strict performance targets, emotionally charged customer interaction, surveillance, and limited autonomy. These characteristics create a context in which psychological safety can be fragile. Workers need to manage customer emotions while also performing under managerial pressure. When internal support is weak, the resulting emotional load becomes heavy. The open-access evidence

suggests that toxic conditions in this setting are not hypothetical but observable and measurable.

From a Psychological Safety Theory perspective, the contact center context is especially vulnerable because the social risk of speaking up may be high. Employees who fear being labeled uncooperative or underperforming may suppress complaints and internalize distress. In such settings, safety is not only a matter of civility; it is a condition for psychological survival at work. The data from Prasetyo et al. (2025) suggest that unhealthy atmospheres and support deficits are already sufficiently widespread to be concerning.

4.2. Evidence from Manufacturing and Industrial Settings

The manufacturing sector provides a more traditional organizational context, and it also shows a clear toxicity–stress linkage. In the study of PT. Machia Jaya Ambon, a toxic work environment had a positive and significant effect on employee work stress (Siahaya et al., 2026). The study involved 51 non-managerial employees and applied simple linear regression. The key finding was not subtle: the worse the work environment, the higher the stress.

This result matters because manufacturing settings are often assumed to be more structured and rule-based than service environments. Yet the evidence shows that structure alone does not prevent toxicity. If interpersonal relations are strained, communication is poor, and workers feel unsupported, stress still rises. This suggests that toxicity is not only a feature of service work or emotionally intensive professions. It can emerge wherever power, communication, and respect are poorly managed.

Theoretical interpretation is straightforward. When a manufacturing workplace is toxic, employees may feel that expressing concerns is risky or futile. Rather than asking questions or raising issues, they may endure the environment silently. This silence is a hallmark of low psychological safety. Over time, it becomes a psychological burden that manifests as stress and emotional depletion. The Ambon study therefore supports the idea that Psychological Safety Theory is applicable beyond knowledge work or team-based innovation contexts.

4.3. Evidence from Education and Teacher Workplaces

The educational sector is not a company sector in the narrowest sense, but it is highly relevant for organizational theory and labor well-being. The 2026 teacher-focused study found that toxic workplace culture, manifested through negative leadership practices, interpersonal conflict, lack of support, and organizational injustice, can significantly exacerbate psychological distress (Makhmanazarova et al., 2026). The authors explicitly state that psychological distress functions as a key mediating factor and that supportive, equitable, and psychologically safe environments are crucial for teacher well-being.

This study is particularly useful because it names psychological distress directly rather than relying solely on stress as a proxy. That makes it conceptually close to the present review. The study also provides an explicit theoretical bridge: toxic culture undermines well-being and disturbs reciprocal organizational relationships. Even though the study draws more directly from occupational stress and social exchange theories than from Psychological Safety Theory, its recommendations align strongly with psychological safety logic.

Teachers operate in emotionally dense settings where interpersonal interaction, role expectations, and institutional hierarchy are constant. If the environment is toxic, teachers may experience fear, fatigue, and mental strain. The study's conclusion that psychologically safe environments are necessary is consistent with the idea that distress is produced when employees cannot safely express concern, disagreement, or vulnerability.

4.4. Evidence from Mixed-Sector Urban Employees

The Medan study provides qualitative evidence that toxicity is linked to mental health strain across urban employee contexts. The authors found that toxic work culture contributed to increased work stress, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion, which in turn reduced productivity (Sinaga, 2026). The study is useful because it presents employees' lived experience rather than only regression coefficients. In qualitative terms, toxicity was described through excessive pressure, ineffective communication, interpersonal conflict, and lack of recognition.

The qualitative findings matter because they reveal the social mechanisms through which distress develops. Employees did not merely report being busy; they reported being psychologically affected. This distinction is important. High workload alone does not necessarily produce psychological distress if the environment is supportive. Toxicity, however, transforms workload into a relational threat. Employees feel trapped, undervalued, and emotionally drained.

This is exactly the kind of situation Psychological Safety Theory predicts. In a safe environment, workers can ask for clarification, seek emotional support, and discuss errors without fear. In a toxic environment, those options are constrained. The employee responds by suppressing voice and carrying the burden alone, which intensifies stress and emotional exhaustion. The Medan evidence therefore reinforces the theoretical argument that toxicity and distress are linked through fear and the absence of interpersonal safety.

4.5. Evidence from Systematic Review Literature

The 2024 systematic literature review on toxic workplace environments and employee productivity adds broader support. The review identified harassment, bullying, ostracism, and incivility as common forms of toxic behavior and concluded that toxic workplace environments significantly increase job stress, decrease employee life satisfaction, and reduce productivity (Sari & Dudija, 2024). The review also emphasized that organizational support and supportive leadership can mitigate these harms.

Although the review did not focus specifically on psychological distress as a singular construct, its findings are highly relevant because job stress, reduced life satisfaction, and lower engagement are all consistent with distress pathways. More importantly, the review supports the general proposition that toxicity is not an isolated or rare phenomenon. Rather, it is a recurring organizational issue with predictable psychological consequences.

The review is especially useful for the present article because it synthesizes evidence from 2017–2023 and thereby provides a background baseline for the 2024–2026 period. Taken together with the newer Indonesian studies, it suggests continuity rather than discontinuity. Toxic work environments remain relevant, and the distress they cause has not disappeared. If anything, the 2024–2026 studies suggest that the problem continues across industries.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1. Is Toxic Work Environment and Psychological Distress a Frequent Phenomenon in 2026?

The existing evidence indicates that the connection between toxic workplaces and psychological distress is frequent enough to be regarded as a significant organizational issue in Indonesia in 2026. It would be excessive to assert that the issue is universal or statistically reflective of all Indonesian firms, as the examined research is sector-focused and somewhat limited in quantity. Nevertheless, it would likewise be incorrect to regard the matter as

uncommon or unusual. The literature indicates a trend developing across various environments: contact centers, manufacturing, education, and urban workforce samples.

The data from the contact center is especially significant as it shows that a considerable portion of employees face an unhealthy environment and increasing stress (Prasetyo et al., 2025). The study on manufacturing indicates that toxicity forecasts stress in a structured industrial environment (Siahaya et al., 2026). The Medan research indicates that toxicity plays a role in stress, anxiety, and emotional fatigue among a diverse urban employee group (Sinaga, 2026). The teacher research indicates a direct focus on psychological distress and clearly advocates for psychologically safe settings (Makhmanazarova et al., 2026). The systematic review subsequently offers a wider context indicating that toxic environments elevate stress levels and reduce life satisfaction (Sari & Dudija, 2024).

These findings are enough to support a careful claim: toxic work environments appear frequently enough in the 2024–2026 Indonesian literature that the phenomenon should be considered an active occupational health concern rather than a marginal case. The word “frequent” should be used cautiously, but the trend is clear. The reviewed literature repeatedly identifies toxic communication, poor support, conflict, and injustice, and repeatedly links them to distress outcomes.

5.2. Does Psychological Safety Theory Hold in the Indonesian Context?

The analysis indicates that Psychological Safety Theory is very credible and empirically valid within the Indonesian setting. The reasoning aligns with the facts. In harmful settings, employees face minimal support, elevated danger, and anxiety over adverse social repercussions. When safety is at a minimum, workers limit their voice, hide their vulnerability, and become excessively alert. This defensive stance incurs psychological costs and may appear as emotional distress.

The theory fits Indonesia well since numerous workplaces are organized by hierarchical connections, norms of respect, and imbalances of power. These structures can heighten the awareness of the fear associated with interpersonal risk. Workers might be reluctant to confront higher-ups, admit errors, or raise concerns about unfairness. In a harmful environment, this reluctance is not just a communication problem; it is a response to anxiety. The employee stays quiet not due to a lack of words, but because expressing themselves could lead to repercussions.

Edmondson’s original argument that learning behavior depends on the belief that the environment is safe for interpersonal risk-taking remains compelling here (Edmondson, 1999). In the Indonesian studies, the reverse condition is repeatedly visible: poor communication, lack of support, conflict, and anxiety about the work climate. These conditions are essentially indicators of low psychological safety. The theory therefore holds not only conceptually but also practically.

5.3. The Role of Social Control in Toxic Workplaces

The social control dimension helps explain how toxic environments produce distress. Toxic workplaces do not only lack support; they often actively regulate behavior through informal punishment. Employees may be excluded from information, ridiculed for speaking honestly, blamed for errors, or subtly isolated. Such control mechanisms reduce autonomy and increase psychological burden.

In these environments, the message is clear: comply, stay quiet, and do not challenge the system. The effect is a workplace culture of fear. Psychological safety is undermined because interpersonal risk becomes too costly. Employees then experience chronic vigilance, which can develop into distress. This is why social control and psychological safety should not

be seen as competing lenses. Rather, social control describes the negative mechanism, while psychological safety describes the missing protective condition.

5.4. Why Distress May Be Underreported?

Another consequence is that psychological distress might be underestimated in organizational research. Numerous employees fail to identify their experience as “distress” despite feeling anxious, emotionally drained, or mentally fatigued. They might instead mention “stress,” “tiredness,” or “lack of motivation.” This indicates that the actual extent of psychological harm related to the workplace might be greater than what the literature clearly documents.

This is significant for narrative review as it indicates that direct constructs of psychological distress might be rarer in Indonesian management research not due to the absence of the phenomenon, but rather because the language of measurement is disjointed. A study might assess stress or burnout, but the root problem could remain psychological distress. The present review thus addresses distress in a wide manner while acknowledging the variety of immediate indicators.

5.5. Sectoral Interpretation

Across sectors, the pattern is similar but the mechanisms differ slightly.

In contact centers, the key issue is emotional labor under surveillance and customer pressure. Toxicity magnifies the emotional load because employees have to manage both external customers and internal organizational threat.

In manufacturing, the key issue is not emotional labor but stable exposure to disrespect, poor communication, and hierarchy. Toxicity there becomes a day-to-day climate issue that wears down workers over time.

In education, the key issue is the combination of high expectations, relational intensity, and institutional hierarchy. Toxic leadership or lack of support can quickly translate into distress because teachers often carry emotional responsibility for others.

In mixed urban employee samples, the key issue is the intersection of pressure, conflict, and weak recognition. Employees experience a general sense that the workplace is not psychologically safe.

These sectoral differences matter because they show that toxic work environment is not one thing. It adapts to the organizational context. Yet the outcome psychological distress remains similar.

6. Implications

This review contributes theoretically by showing that Psychological Safety Theory is not only relevant for team learning or innovation, but also for understanding mental health outcomes in Indonesian organizations. The theory explains why toxicity produces distress: employees do not merely dislike the environment; they feel unsafe within it. The lack of safety changes cognition, emotion, and behavior.

The review also suggests that social control should be integrated more explicitly into future psychological safety research. In many toxic workplaces, the absence of safety is reinforced by control practices such as blame, silence, monitoring, and exclusion. Future theory building can benefit from linking psychological safety, social control, and distress more tightly.

7. Conclusions

This narrative review set out to determine whether toxic work environment and psychological distress constitute a meaningful phenomenon in Indonesian multisector organizations during 2024–2026, and whether Psychological Safety Theory helps explain the relationship. The answer is yes, with important qualifications. The phenomenon appears repeatedly across open-access studies in contact centers, manufacturing, education, and urban employee settings. The reviewed literature consistently links toxic environments with stress, anxiety, emotional exhaustion, and broader psychological distress. Although the evidence base is still fragmented, it is sufficiently coherent to suggest that toxic work environment and psychological distress are active concerns in Indonesian organizational life.

Psychological Safety Theory offers a convincing explanation because it captures the central mechanism: employees in toxic environments do not feel safe to speak, ask, or disagree. That loss of safety increases emotional burden and reduces adaptive functioning. In this sense, psychological safety is not a peripheral concept but a core explanatory condition for understanding distress in toxic workplaces. The review therefore concludes that the theory remains applicable and useful for the Indonesian context in 2026, especially when combined with an awareness of social control processes that suppress voice and intensify fear.

8. References

- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
- Makhmanazarova, I. A., Ciptagustia, A., & Xoldorov, S. U. (2026). Toxic workplace culture, psychological distress, and turnover intention among teachers: A moderated mediation study. *Pioneering Studies and Theories*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20127769>
- Prasetyo, E. A., Maghfirah, A., Ridho, A., Lubabin Nuqul, F., Rahayu, I. T., & colleagues. (2025). Toxic workplace, workstress, and employee performance: Predictive model. *Journal of Indonesian Psychological Science*, 5(1), 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jips.v5i1.32120>
- Sari, R. D., & Dudija, N. (2024). The impact of toxic workplace environments on employee productivity: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Science, Technology & Management*, 5(4), 1–? <https://doi.org/10.46729/ijstm.v5i4.1129>
- Siahaya, L. D. I., Titioka, S. R., & Aponno, E. H. (2026). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja toksik terhadap stres kerja pada PT. Machia Jaya Ambon. *Jurnal Administrasi Terapan*, 5(1), 90–?
- Sinaga, H. M. V. (2026). Analisis toxic work culture terhadap kesehatan mental dan produktivitas karyawan di Kota Medan. *Musytari: Jurnal Manajemen, Akuntansi, dan Ekonomi*, 25(2), 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.2324/3a1ymd58>