

Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance

Diah Fatma Sjoraida (1) and Anggun Yolistina, S.Kom (2) (1) Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung | (2) Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

Diah.fatma@unpad.ac.id ; Anggun_yolistina@gmail.com

Abstract

This integrative evidence review examines psychological safety and cross-functional innovation performance by asking how psychological safety is connected to cross-functional innovation performance and which conditions determine whether that connection becomes operationally meaningful. The article synthesizes peer-reviewed and institutional literature relevant to people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, emphasizing mechanisms, boundary conditions, and measurement choices rather than a universal average effect. Evidence associated with Edmondson et al., 2014 and Marler et al., 2017 is read with the wider source set to distinguish formal adoption from effective use, short-term response from durable capability, and observed association from causal interpretation. The synthesis identifies complementary roles for psychological safety and voice, digital literacy, and governance or coordination routines. No survey, interview, experiment, proprietary dataset, or regression estimate is represented as having been collected for this conceptual review.

Keywords: psychological, safety, cross-functional, innovation, performance, management, integrative review

Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance addresses a contemporary question in people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems. The title implies a relationship between psychological safety and cross-functional innovation performance, but the direction and magnitude of that relationship cannot be assumed from terminology alone. This review identifies mechanisms that plausibly connect the two, conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker, and measurements needed to evaluate them without overstating evidence. Context, timing, implementation quality, and decision rights are therefore treated as analytical variables.

1. Introduction

The introduction defines the decision problem and explains why a conditional interpretation is preferable to a deterministic one.

A recurring issue in research on Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Psychological Safety may be associated with cross-functional innovation performance, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when digital literacy is weak. The mechanism examined here is work design and autonomy, which

connects the focal practice to changes in innovation performance. Sources such as Doz et al., 2010 and Kraus et al., 2022 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, psychological safety can influence cross-functional innovation performance through performance feedback and alignment. The pathway is conditional on team interdependence and leadership credibility; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce service quality.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, psychological safety can influence cross-functional innovation performance through talent mobility and succession routines. The pathway is conditional on workforce diversity and team interdependence; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce organizational resilience.

A recurring issue in research on Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Psychological Safety may be associated with cross-functional innovation performance, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when resource slack is weak. The mechanism examined here is sensemaking and change communication, which connects the focal practice to changes in employee readiness.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Psychological safety and voice is most credible when supported by change fatigue and leadership credibility. The reviewed literature (Kraus et al., 2022; Doz et al., 2010) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

2. Conceptual and Literature Review

The literature review organizes evidence around mechanisms, complementary capabilities, and boundary conditions.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Performance feedback and alignment is most credible when supported by digital literacy and change fatigue. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Talent mobility and succession routines is most credible when supported by team interdependence and digital literacy. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Sensemaking and change communication provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on workforce diversity, workforce diversity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of employee readiness.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, psychological safety can influence cross-functional innovation performance through psychological safety and voice. The pathway is conditional on resource slack and change fatigue; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce role clarity.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Capability building and coaching is most credible when supported by change fatigue and digital literacy. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded. Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible

coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Evidence Synthesis: Mechanisms

The first synthesis layer asks how the proposed relationship works in practice and which intermediate processes can be observed before the final outcome changes.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Sensemaking and change communication is most credible when supported by digital literacy and digital literacy. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Psychological safety and voice is most credible when supported by team interdependence and workforce diversity. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Capability building and coaching provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on workforce diversity, change fatigue, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Kraus et al., 2022 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of learning speed.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, psychological safety can influence cross-functional innovation performance through work design and autonomy. The pathway is conditional on resource slack and digital literacy; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Edmondson et al., 2014 and Verhoef et al., 2021 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For executives, line

managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce innovation performance.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, psychological safety can influence cross-functional innovation performance through performance feedback and alignment. The pathway is conditional on change fatigue and workforce diversity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Marler et al., 2017 and Edmondson et al., 2014 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as

background noise. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce service quality.

5. Evidence Synthesis: Boundary Conditions

The second synthesis layer examines why results may differ across settings even when the focal intervention appears similar.

A recurring issue in research on Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Psychological Safety may be associated with cross-functional innovation performance, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when digital literacy is weak. The mechanism examined here is psychological safety and voice, which connects the focal practice to changes in role clarity. Sources such as Kraus et al., 2022 and Kraus et al., 2022 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Capability building and coaching provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on team interdependence, resource slack, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Verhoef et al., 2021 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of learning speed.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Work design and autonomy provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on workforce diversity, leadership credibility, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Edmondson et al., 2014 and Edmondson et al., 2014 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in

starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of innovation performance.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Performance feedback and alignment is most credible when supported by resource slack and team interdependence. The reviewed literature (Marler et al., 2017; Marler et al., 2017) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Talent mobility and succession routines is most credible when supported by change fatigue and resource slack. The reviewed literature (Doz et al., 2010; Doz et al., 2010) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

6. Integrated Discussion

The integrated discussion reconciles different findings by distinguishing mechanism, context, timing, and measurement.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, psychological safety can influence cross-functional innovation performance through capability building and coaching. The pathway is conditional on digital literacy and workforce diversity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Verhoef et al., 2021 and Edmondson et al., 2014 supports treating implementation

conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce learning speed.

The synthesis treats psychological safety as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of cross-functional innovation performance. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, work design and autonomy changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while team interdependence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is

consistent with Edmondson et al., 2014 and Marler et al., 2017 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Performance feedback and alignment provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on workforce diversity, digital literacy, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Marler et al., 2017 and Doz et al., 2010 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of service quality.

A recurring issue in research on Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Psychological Safety may be associated with cross-functional innovation performance, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when resource slack is weak. The mechanism examined here is talent mobility and succession routines, which connects the focal practice to changes in organizational resilience.

The synthesis treats psychological safety as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of cross-functional innovation performance. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, sensemaking and change communication changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while change fatigue shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

7. Measurement and Decision Framework

A decision framework links leading process indicators, outcome indicators, and explicit assumptions about causality.

The synthesis treats psychological safety as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of cross-functional innovation performance. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, work design and autonomy changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while digital literacy shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Edmondson et al., 2014 and Doz et al., 2010 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Performance feedback and alignment provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on team interdependence, leadership credibility, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a

leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of service quality.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Talent mobility and succession routines is most credible when supported by workforce diversity and team interdependence. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Sensemaking and change communication provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on resource slack, resource slack, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of employee readiness.

A recurring issue in research on Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Psychological Safety may be associated with cross-functional innovation performance, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when change fatigue is weak. The mechanism examined here is psychological safety and voice, which connects the focal practice to changes in role clarity.

8. Practical Implications and Research Agenda

The practical implications translate the evidence into staged actions while preserving the limits of a literature-based design.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Performance feedback and alignment is most credible when supported by digital literacy and change fatigue. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Talent mobility and succession routines provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on team interdependence, digital literacy, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of organizational resilience.

From a governance perspective, Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Sensemaking and change communication is most credible when supported by workforce diversity and workforce diversity. The article therefore emphasizes

traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Psychological safety and voice provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on resource slack, change fatigue, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of role clarity.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, psychological safety can influence cross-functional innovation performance through capability building and coaching. The pathway is conditional on change fatigue and digital literacy; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce learning speed.

9. Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes the evidence logic and priorities for author verification and future empirical work.

A recurring issue in research on Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Psychological Safety may be associated with cross-functional innovation performance, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when digital

literacy is weak. The mechanism examined here is talent mobility and succession routines, which connects the focal practice to changes in organizational resilience. Sources such as Doz et al., 2010 and Kraus et al., 2022 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

A recurring issue in research on Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Psychological Safety may be associated with cross-functional innovation performance, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when team interdependence is weak. The mechanism examined here is sensemaking and change communication, which connects the focal practice to changes in employee readiness.

For Psychological Safety and Cross-Functional Innovation Performance, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking psychological safety with cross-functional innovation performance. Capability building and coaching provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on resource slack, leadership credibility, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading

indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of learning speed.

Historical source context and interpretation

The Future of Jobs Report 2023 provides pre-cutoff context on employer expectations about changing jobs and skills (World Economic Forum, 2023). Expectations reported in this source are not realized outcomes or causal estimates. The managerial mechanisms discussed here remain propositions that require organization-specific evidence.

References

- 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, 23-43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305>
- Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR Analytics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(1), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1244699>
- Doz, Y. L., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 370-382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.006>
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466>
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- World Economic Forum. (2023). The Future of Jobs Report 2023. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2023/>