

# Enmity, Respect and Well-Being at Work: The Case of Workers in Private Companies in Abidjan

Mariam Coulibaly, Inoussa Dabone

Department of Psychology, University Felix Houphouet-Boigny, Abidjan, Ivory Coast

## Email address:

dabino2002@yahoo.fr (Inoussa Dabone)

## To cite this article:

Mariam Coulibaly, Inoussa Dabone. (2023). Enmity, Respect and Well-Being at Work: The Case of Workers in Private Companies in Abidjan. *International Journal of Psychological Science*, 3(2), 12-18. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijps.20230302.11>

**Received:** November 1, 2023; **Accepted:** November 21, 2023; **Published:** November 29, 2023

---

**Abstract:** *Introduction and objectives:* In a context where Ivorian companies are suffering the effects of the crisis situation that the country has gone through and stress factors at work, many workers encounter problems related to mental and physical health. The individual and collective life of the persons at work is then put to the test. In particular, Abidjan workers are increasingly demanding in terms of well-being in their workplace. The present study therefore aims to explain the level of well-being at work by interactional factors such as enmity and respect at work. *Method:* The study sample consists of 400 workers. These are selected by the quota method. The data collection instrument is a multidimensional questionnaire including a measure of well-being at work: that of the Duke Health Profile (DHP). This questionnaire was subject to a multi-step validation procedure. The data collected from workers are analyzed by T test and Anova techniques. *Results:* The results show that enmity and respect at work have a significant effect on people's well-being at work. *Conclusion:* Thus, the level of well-being of workers is high on the one hand when there is no enmity at work and, on the other hand, when there is respect at work. These results suggest to take into account the variables enmity and respect at work when reinforcing people's well-being at work.

**Keywords:** Well-Being, Enmity, Respect, Work, Interaction

---

## 1. Introduction

It is customary to assert that work allows human beings to live. Indeed, work makes it possible for people to meet the needs for food, housing, clothing, health, education, and even to afford luxuries. However, we also know that individuals who do not have a professional activity do not feel happy, even when all their economic needs are met [1]. This situation of idleness leads to a feeling of alienation characterized by a state of emptiness, apathy and boredom as well as a feeling of inauthenticity, emotional dissonance and helplessness. This shows that work satisfies other needs than the services paid for with wages.

Work has an important place in the life of most individuals, not only in terms of self-realization, time devoted to it or economic necessity, but also in terms of social or interpersonal relationships [2] since the workers meet other people with whom they maintain relations in their workplace. This principle makes the workplace a social relationship that can not be reduced to an individual dimension. It engages a complicity of relationships between professionals and is part

of a combination of invention and appropriation of collective know-how [3].

Despite the importance of workplace community, relationships at work are not always the way we want them to be. They are sometimes deficient or conflicting causing heavy emotional demands that cause suffering at work. Indeed, interactions at work are considered both as a factor of well-being and as risks triggering discomfort, stress and suffering [4].

Concretely, relationships in the workplace are born, develop and evolve through interactions. Thus, the company is a social environment where workers interact daily simply because of their proximity. From these interactions, some altercations can arise and affect emotions negatively or positively. Phenomena such as harassment, violence, attacks, whether moral or verbal, therefore occur during interactions between workers. These interactions are likely to have an impact on individuals' psychic balance and well-being at work. The present study therefore proposes to analyze the well-being at work and its interactional sources such as enmity and respect at work.

In Ivory Coast, the rate of increase in psychosocial risks at workplace is a sign of the poor working conditions that authors such as N'Guessan denounce [5]. This researcher highlights in particular the case of absenteeism. He mentions that absenteeism is increasingly pronounced in Ivorian industrial companies and has a negative impact on their productivity and profitability. At the civil service, the checks carried out in 2012 revealed that approximately one thousand (1 000) civil servants were regularly absent from their workstation because they were working simultaneously in the civil service and in private companies. This behaviour caused to the country the loss of several hundred million francs according to the Ministry of Civil Service and Administrative Reform (MFPRA).

We can therefore affirm that the high rate of psychosocial risks and the lack of well-being among workers are not only caused by the poor organizational conditions. Some other factors such as poor relations between colleagues are potential sources of nuisance that are often overlooked. The present study proposes to examine workers' well-being according to interactional practices in the workplace such as enmity and respect. The study has therefore a dual interest: social and scientific.

From the social point of view, employees do not want to be in a situation of suffering at work. This wish should be taken into account by business leaders in the perspective of their productivist ambitions [6]. Indeed, this should contribute to their wishes to improve work performance and reduce ailments such as turnover, absenteeism, burn-out, lateness, slow production, retention of information and conflict at work.

From the scientific point of view, the theme of well-being at work is experiencing renewed interest among researchers today. This leads to an increasingly abundant empirical studies highlighting different categories of psychological, socio-demographic and economic factors to explain the phenomenon. The perspective of interactional factors developed here in the workplace will contribute to improving knowledge in this area. To this end, the question that arises is whether the level of well-being at work varies according to the factors enmity and respect at work. More specifically, is well-being at work influenced by enmity at work ? Is it also influenced by respect at work ?

The study of interactional factors' impact on well-being at work is part of a conceptual approach whose clarification is a prerequisite. This conceptual approach focuses on notions arising from interaction and well-being concepts. In psychology, interaction is based on actions which can be intrapersonal (cognitive decision followed by pragmatic actions or followed by an expressive action) or interpersonal (cognitive reaction to the pragmatic action of another person and affective reaction to the pragmatic action of the other). Grossen [7] approaches interaction in the sense of the relationship between the individual and his social environment. Thus, to be in interaction is to adhere to the social system in which you find yourself. Marc and Picard [8] support this idea by stating that certain forms of interaction

generate negative affects and are likely to harm the individual's psychological balance.

From this perspective, enmity at work represents a negative form of interaction relating to conflicts, rivalry, segregation, insults, discrimination, anger, hatred, etc.); respect at work represents the positive form of interaction relating to adaptation and integration. However, a clarification on these notions of interaction is necessary.

Enmity, from its Latin origin "*inimicitia*", is an expression that refers to hostility and unfriendly feelings. It appears to be a form of negative interaction, a belated expression of a struggle against other people sharing the same living environment and limited resources, which calls for a conflict of interest [9]. In the workplace, it comes in two forms. On the one hand, it can be manifest through physical brutality, threats, unwarranted thoughts about work. On the other hand, it can be sneaky through acts of sabotage, negative reviews and unfair treatment. Lignier and Pagis [10] consider it to be the early expression of social distance. In this study, enmity at work is analyzed in the two forms: sneaky and overt. It's a negative feeling or aversion, against someone or a community, which hinders interpersonal relationships at work. It is expressed through negative judgments about colleagues as well as the maintenance of negative relationships with them.

Respect is a concept that also has its origins in a Latin term: "*respectus*" which is related to consideration, esteem or deference. Its meaning evolves [11] as it's increasingly recognized, not only as a feeling or an attitude (of consideration, or even veneration, that one can have to others) but also a value. Indeed, it's above all a value, a constitutive fundamental human virtue to be transmitted from generation to generation. It is expressed by an attitude of deference and by the concern not to hurt unnecessarily or undermine the object of respect. In the workplace, it is manifested by reciprocal behavior of politeness, consideration, valorization and esteem likely to reinforce well-being.

Well-being is a concept that has its origins in the work of Greek philosophers. It is particularly difficult to define as its definition has been subject to abuse [12]. We therefore recall that it differs from related terms such as quality of life, happiness and satisfaction. Indeed, well-being is a multidimensional positive psychological state that by definition rules out the negative aspects of mental health. It is a pleasant feeling provided by the satisfaction of physical, mental and social needs. Of these multiple definitions, we rely on the definition given by Guillemin et al. [13] emphasizing that occupational health is the result of physical, mental and social well-being. Thus, well-being at work is a feeling of pleasure which includes on the one hand physical well-being linked to adequate working conditions, both in terms of controlling occupational risks and in terms of work organization and its adjustment to the needs and personal capacities of individuals. It also includes on the other hand mental well-being, which is felt mainly by the recognition that the individual receives for his work and by the feeling of being in coherence with his own values, and the social well-

being which results from the adequacy between the values of the workers and those of the structure in which they participate and work.

The question of well-being at work is all the more worrying in Ivory Coast since a large proportion of cases relating to psychiatric services are listed among requests for sick leave (23.8% among civil service workers). In an environment where psychological disorders give the victim a devaluing status, workers with such difficulties are subject to risks of stigmatization. The work relations then become even more unsuitable, cause even more toxic workplace and increase psychosocial risks at work. Faced with this reality, we must be concerned with the impact of interactional factors such as enmity and respect at work in order to improve well-being at work.

Bernard [6] places at the center of the authentic definition of well-being at work the coherence between the individual and the work (nature of the work, tasks that the work involves or relationships that the work entails). The link between this variable and the interactional factors can be studied in the light of the Broaden-and-Build Theory of Fredrickson [14]. For this theory, emotions are linked to circumstances that are personally significant for the individual. The theory views positive emotions as indicators of optimal functioning that generate more psychological well-being. Positive emotions have the ability to momentarily "expand" our repertoire of thoughts and actions and "build" our personal physical, intellectual, social and psychological resources. It shows that the behavior of the individual, as well as his level of well-being, is conditioned according to whether he is guided by negative emotions or by positive emotions. These considerations allow us to formulate the hypothesis that the interactional factors at work are decisive in the development of the level of well-being at work. From this flow the following three operational hypotheses: H1: The level of well-being at work is higher among workers who are not subject to enmity than among those who are subject to enmity at work, H2: The level of well-being at work is higher among workers who are respected than among those who are not respected at work, H3: Considered together, the absence of enmity and the fact of being respected at work have a significant impact on well-being at work.

## 2. Methodology

This study brings into play the independent variables – enmity and respect at work – which are related to the dependent variable well-being at work. In this part, it is a question of indicating the characteristics of each of these variables, relating to their function, their nature and their level as well as the meaning of these levels.

The parent population is made up of all the workers of the chosen commercial enterprise. It covers categories as diverse as executives (15), supervisors (65), technicians and similar (280) and commercial agents (246). A non-probability technique called quota sampling was used in this study. The quota technique can be used, since the number of workers is

known and the frequencies according to the necessary characteristics of the parent population can be established. The control variables used for the implementation of quota sampling in this study are gender and socio-professional category. However, knowing the size of the sample and the size of the parent population appears essential for calculating the sampling rate.

In order to achieve the survey objectives, the sample size was estimated according to Bernoulli's formula with the margin of error of 5%. So from N= 606 workers (population size mother) the sample created must include at least 84 workers. Therefore, we chose to interview 400 people working in the company. Taking into account the selected variables (socio-professional category and sex), we arrive at the following characteristics of the sample: 10 executives, including 2 women and 8 men; 185 technicians and assimilated, including 40 women and 145 men; 43 supervisors, including 15 women and 28 men and finally, 162 sales representatives, including 129 women and 33 men.

### 2.1. Data Collection Instrument

The members of the sample all accepted to answer our research instrument which is a multidimensional questionnaire comprising three axes. The first axis, which concerns the biographical characteristics, apprehends the data relating to the controlled variables which are in this case gender, professional category and seniority of the workers questioned. The second axis includes questions concerning the independent variables enmity and respect at work. These questions were constructed using indicators resulting from the analysis of these concepts. These questions are of the dichotomous type, offering respondents two choices of answers "yes" and "no". The third axis of the questionnaire concerns the measurement of well-being at work. The Duke Health Profile (DHP) measurement, translated into French by Guillemin et al. [13], was used. This questionnaire underwent a validation procedure in several stages. First, the instrument was submitted to ten people of various statuses with a good knowledge of the working environment in Ivory Coast, as part of a qualitative evaluation called expert judgment. The pre-test phase of the instrument then made it possible to develop the final version of the questionnaire. The time of administration of this instrument varies from 11 to 17 minutes.

The resulting questionnaire was administered face-to-face. The collected data was put through a counting system to be ready for analysis.

### 2.2. Analysis of the Data Collected

The procedure for analyzing the information collected was carried out according to the 3 axes of the questionnaire. In the first axis, it was a question of identifying the subjects through their professional social categories, the second axis concerned the items on the independent variables and the third concerned the scale of measurement of the dependent variable well-being at work. This scale has seventeen (17) items that have been rated positively as follows: Not at all =

1, A little = 2, A lot = 3. When the items are of negative valence, the rating principle is reversed and is presented as follows: Not at all = 3, A little = 2 and A lot = 1. This rating gives us scores between 17 and 51. Workers with a score of 17 to 34 have a low level of well-being and workers with a score of 34 to 51 have a high level of well-being.

### 3. Result

Since the measured variable is continuous quantitative, the statistical technique of T test was used for data analysis. In principle, the use of the T test assumes that the measured variable adopts a normal distribution. Therefore, we have previously checked the conditions of use of this statistical test. We examined the skewness asymmetry and kurtosis coefficients. These values are 0.306 and 1.613 respectively. These coefficients correspond to the standard between -1.96

and 1.96. This attests to the normality of the distribution of values concerning well-being at work and justifies the use of the T test. The results of the study make it possible to consider the specific effects of each independent variable as well as the joint effect of these variables on the level of well-being at work. This analysis leads to the following three levels of results.

#### 3.1. Enmity and Well-Being at Work

The two groups of workers constituted by the "absence" and the "presence" of enmity at work appear comparable according to Levene's test of homogeneity ( $F=0.950$ , ns). This is the basis for using Student's t for the comparison of these two means. The results relating to the link between the solidarity at work variable and the worker's level of well-being are provided by the following table.

*Table 1. Effect of enmity at work on well-being at work.*

	Enmity at work	Size	Average	Standard deviation	T test	Sig.
Well-being at work	Presence of enmity	n1 = 61	m1 = 37,52	$\sigma_1 = 5,485$	-4,142	0,001
	Absence of enmity	n2 = 339	m2 = 40,25	$\sigma_2 = 4,586$		

We note from this table that the workers' well-being is on average higher when there is absence of enmity ( $m=40.25$ ) than when there is enmity ( $m=37.52$ ) at work. The analysis of this difference in well-being between the two groups indicates  $T=-2.31$  ( $p \leq 0.021$ ). This leads to rejecting the null hypothesis and retaining the working hypothesis H1 according to which the level of well-being at work is higher among workers who are not subject to enmity than those who are subject to enmity.

#### 3.2. Respect at Work and Well-Being at Work

The two groups of workers constituted by the "absence" and the "presence" of respect at work are comparable according to the Levene homogeneity test ( $F=0.930$ , ns). Student's T test can therefore be used to compare the two means. The results concerning the link between the variable respect at work and the level of well-being of the worker are provided by the table below.

*Table 2. Effect of respect at work on well-being at work.*

	Respect at work	Size	Average	Standard deviation	T test	Sig.
Well-being at work	Absence of Respect	n3 = 77	m3 = 37,97	$\sigma_3 = 5,22$	-3,828	0,001
	Presence of respect	n4 = 323	m4 = 40,28	$\sigma_4 = 4,63$		

It emerges from the previous table that the average of the workers' well-being is higher when there is respect at work ( $m=40.28$ ) than when there is no respect at work ( $m=37.97$ ). Analysis of this difference between the two groups indicates  $T=-3.828$  ( $p \leq 0.001$ ). This leads to rejecting the null hypothesis and retaining the working hypothesis H2 according to which the level of well-being at work is higher among workers who are respected than among those who are

not respected at work.

#### 3.3. Joint Effect of Enmity and Respect on Well-Being at Work

The interaction effects of the "enmity" and "respect" variables on the worker's level of well-being are summarized in the table below. After.

*Table 3. Result of the analysis of interaction effects on well-being.*

Source	Sum of squares type III	ddl	Mean of squares	Sig.
Enmity	26,347	1	26,347	0,273
Respect	1,217	1	1,217	0,814
Enmity * Respect	13,651	1	13,651	0,430

The previous table shows results of between-subjects effects analysis. Significance values greater than the P-value of significance 0.05 are noted. We can therefore consider the null hypothesis  $H_0$  according to which there is no interaction effect of the two factors on the level of well-being at work.

### 4. Discussion

Aiming to study the well-being of workers based on interactional factors such as enmity and respect at work, the

present study reached the results that these two factors have a significant effect on well-being at work. We noticed concerning the first result that the variable enmity at work influences significantly well-being at work. This result confirms the first hypothesis H1 which assumes that the level of well-being at work is lower among workers subject to enmity than workers who are not subject to enmity. This link has been observed as an answer to the question of the effect of enmity in the work social environment on the level of well-being at work. A significant relationship has also been noticed concerning the second result between respect at work and well-being at work. Thus we can confirm the hypothesis H2 according to which the level of well-being at work is higher among workers who are respected than among those who are not respected at work.

These results examined in the light of the Broaden-and-Build Theory demonstrate that interactional factors are decisive in improving the well-being of workers. This theory teaches that positive emotions – such as joy, satisfaction, interest and love – are indicators of well-being. These emotions bring about an optimal functioning that generates psychological well-being. It is therefore understandable that behaviors of enmity or lack of respect at work have the effect of lowering the level of well-being of workers. Indeed, the interactions and the nature of the relationships that the worker has with his colleagues cause positive or negative emotions in him. As a result, his behavior and his level of well-being in particular are conditioned according to whether he is driven by negative or by positive emotions. Thus the respect at work, which characterizes the attitudes and behavior of workers towards each other by virtue of their sense of humanity, is capable of arousing positive emotions. It is a type of work environment where one refrains from any denigration, false or misleading words against a colleague, where one always maintains the appropriate professional tone even in professional conflict situations [15]. In such a working environment, the atmosphere is positive and people feel better about each other. The results also teach that environments where there is a lack of respect can bring their workers to feel useless since those ones don't receive a boost in their self-esteem [16]. The then unpleasant exercise of the work and the negative emotion arising from it end up affecting workers' well-being.

While positive emotions can momentarily "expand" our repertoire of thoughts and actions and "build" our personal resources (physical, intellectual, social and psychological), this is not the case with negative emotions such as those aroused by enmity at work. The results of this research indicate that enmity at work rather lowers workers' level of well-being. Thus, the "responses" to positive emotions make it possible to build oneself in a sustainable way. Indeed, they allow to develop the reflex of being more active, more open and to acquire new knowledge. Looking back allows us to remember that well-being at work is defined as a feeling or a state of physical, mental and social plenitude. As we indicated above, this state of plenitude is linked to what individuals experience every day during their work, in the

relationships they have with their colleagues. These are positive interpersonal interactions that increase the worker's level of well-being, while negative interpersonal interactions prevent him from flourishing and lead to the reduction of his well-being. Enmity at work is analyzed under its two dimensions: negative judgment and negative relationships at work. It designates an unhealthy and counter-productive behavior at work that manifests itself in contempt, denial of work recognition or even degrading attacks from colleagues. This is an existing conflict between two or more colleagues from which the individual targeted by these behaviors finds himself unable to perform his work correctly and is also affected mentally. It therefore seems logical that the results show a negative effect of enmity on well-being at work. This negative effect occurs at two levels. First, enmity refers to the negative feelings that the individual has, such that he considers others as persons to be despised, destroyed or even eliminated. The worker unable to manage these feelings can find himself in a situation which creates an emotional imbalance that hinders his well-being at work. Second, workplace enmity presupposes the existence of a strained relationship between workers. It calls into question their ability to maintain a healthy and good quality professional relationship. Indeed, enmity negatively influences well-being at work based on the existence of negative judgments and negative relationships. Thus, the well-being of individuals who find themselves in a relationship of enmity becomes low.

Our first result allows us to identify two aspects of the relationship between enmity at work and well-being at work: on the one hand, the presence of enmity which lowers well-being at work and, on the other hand the absence of enmity which promotes well-being at work. The presence of enmity in the relationships between workers then reduces the level of well-being at work. This is the case of someone who has as a colleague an individual whom he considers to be harmful or dangerous to him. This feeling leads to actions that tend to degrade well-being. These actions may be damage to property, sabotage, nuisance through unjust or unfounded criticism, gossiping, swearing and withholding information necessary for the job. To these actions, workers tend to stay away from their colleagues who are a threat to their development. In addition, the absence of enmity promotes well-being at work when workers are willing to maintain a good relationship in the workplace. At this level, the worker doesn't consider any colleague as unhealthy or malicious. There are no animosities that could cause distrust and hinder well-being. This result relating to the first operational hypothesis (H1) issued is supported by some researchers in their work on enmity. These works actually demonstrate the characteristics of enmity and the manifestation of this feeling towards the other. They also demonstrate the negative effect of enmity by defining it as an aversion against others. At this level we can claim that these studies go in the direction of our reasoning and confirm our results. Among these works, we can cite Eiguer [17] who deduces in his study that when the subject feels the target of enmity, he develops in him self-hatred. According to him, some humans show contempt for

this other, unknown or different by devaluing, discriminating, neglecting, even hating him. Thus, the stigmatized person identifies with the one who rejects him by attacking his self, hence the appearance of hatred of himself and of the other. It therefore highlights the complex spring of enmity brought towards self-hatred and hatred of the other and its psychological and psychosocial consequences. The results of the study by Eigner [17] present enmity as a factor of disunity and annihilation, leading to the deterioration of the health of the individuals targeted by this aversion. Jeantet [18] stipulates that the individual must seek to experience pleasure in his work, chase away the unpleasant emotions that constitute fear or boredom, try not to get into too violent anger or let himself be affected by sadness. Otherwise he runs the risk of a malaise that can go as far as depression.

With this in mind, we cannot fail to say that some studies contradict our analysis of the negative influence of enmity. Those studies often show another side of enmity, which is not categorically opposed to the idea that this feeling leads to a lack of well-being. Nevertheless, they do not always mention the relationship of enmity as a harmful phenomenon. They see it as potentially useful for individuals. Errazuriz [9] cites two authors (the first Machiavelli and the second Nietzsche) who note that man can take advantage of enmity and that he can obtain from it benefits that no other form of relationship is able to provide him. From these authors we can deduce that enmity is not always negative and that it can lead to a kind of personalized valuation. The first of these authors presents enmity as an opportunity to achieve greatness, not moral but political. The second author presents enmity as an essential space for the release of human energies, which otherwise risk poisoning the individual. These authors try to explain that the presence of an enemy makes it possible to harmonize one's life by observing around oneself and controlling one's actions. These controllings will lead the individual to moral improvement and make him beyond reproach. This version does not make enmity an essential practice, but a contingent that we could use as they emphasize. Therefore, comparing their analysis with ours would mean that even if enmity relationship causes anxiety, the threatened individual can question himself and closely observe his actions. This development does not eliminate the fact that worry about the presence of a threat leads to a lack of fulfillment. In confrontation with our results, these studies are not essentially the opposite, but they are located in another kind of research which aims to show the importance of enemy in the life of a person. This perspective can challenge the categorical idea that enmity leads to evil, without however denying it.

Certainly, the positive effect of respect at work is demonstrated by the present study, however there are discrepancies. Unlike us, Grover [16] highlights variables other than well-being at work, which are self-esteem and commitment to work in relation to respect at work. In addition, he distinguishes in his analysis the types of respect giving a broader conception of respect at work. Diep et al. [11] also reveal that organizational respect is positively related to work commitment and distinguish recognition

respect from evaluation respect. As a result of their work on respect, bullying and commitment to work, they reveal that followers' experience of feeling the respect of recognition from their leaders was positively related to positive attitudes in terms of respect for the leaders. These positive attitudes were negatively associated with the perception of being bullied at work which in turn is negatively related to commitment. These results explain that the relationship between positive attitudes and the perception of bullying and commitment to work is not significant. Additionally, they found that respect moderates the relationship between workplace bullying and work engagement. Unlike Diep et al. [11] who study respect at work in the working relationship between the leader and the subjects, reveal that the respect felt in recognition is directly related to the positive respect of a leader's ability (respect for the evaluation). The present research reveals the positive effect of respect at work on workers' level of well-being. The reason for this subtle difference is that Diep et al. [11] conduct their study in the context of the "leader-subordinate" relationship, the feeling of recognition of respect having profoundly positive results in terms of work commitment.

The results of this research are in line with the work of Clarke and Mahadi [19] which found a bidirectional congruence of leader and follower respect on job performance and employee well-being. Their results support the finding confirming the H2 hypothesis of the present study. According to Clarke and Mahadi [20] giving and receiving respect promotes a positive relational identity. These authors found that mutual recognition compliance predicted both job performance and employee well-being. Decker and Van [20] also study interpersonal respect in the leadership relationship. They confirm the positive influence of respect in the quality of work relations and its effect on the individual and his work. Their study is nevertheless situated in the leader-subordinate relationship like the others mentioned above. According to these authors, working for a leader who treats his subordinates with respect is one of the most valuable aspects in daily work. They argue that how one views the source of respect can be just as important as the condition of being respected. In other words, subordinates may be more deeply affected by a leader's respect or disrespect if that leader is held in high esteem. To explain this dynamic, they argue that self-determination is a key factor in respectful leadership and that supporting self-determination is experienced differently depending on the type of respect (horizontal and vertical) of the source. The results reveal that working for a respectful leader leads to more job satisfaction and less intention to leave. Both relationships (leader-subordinate and subordinate-leader) are mediated by self-determination and moderated by subordinates' vertical respect for their leaders. In conclusion, they were able to show that the interplay between respectful leadership and subordinates' vertical respect for leaders is important for subordinates' work and their willingness to stay in office. Respect at work must be applied to everyone at work. Therefore, we can say that the present study suggests significant contributions to the

scientific knowledge, given the proven importance of respect in well-being at work.

## 5. Conclusion

Work plays a key role in explaining the psychological health of individuals. It connects them to the social and economic world and is a vehicle for individual satisfaction and fulfillment. Even if we did not choose our colleagues, we must nevertheless collaborate with them for the proper functioning of the work. These imposed relationships are therefore sometimes very badly lived and cause the appearance of an imbalance affecting the health. Interactions at work therefore put the worker between risk and opportunity. That reality leads us to relate well-being at work and interactional factors. The aim of this study was thus to highlight the influence of the factors enmity at work, respect at work on the well-being of workers, to better understand the contours of the lack of well-being at work. The results allowed the confirmation of the study hypotheses. So, the interactional factors significantly influence well-being at work. These results should therefore contribute to the promotion of well-being at work and to the reduction of workers' negative attitudes and behaviors that can hinder good organizational functioning. This work brings to the attention of practitioners who aim to promote well-being at work the effect of some interactional factors (enmity, respect). It therefore contributes to the development of workers' health protection and mental safety in the daily life of organizations. On the managerial level, this work could contribute to sensitizing the leaders on the virtues of a work environment favoring interactions devoid of enmity and marked by respect between colleagues.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## References

- [1] Dortier, J. F. (2017). Pourquoi travaille-t-on? In Ouvrage collectif, *La motivation* (p. 61-69) Auxerre, Éditions Sciences Humaines.
- [2] Jauvin, N. (2003). *La violence organisationnelle: parcours conceptuel et théorique et proposition d'un modèle compréhensif intégrateur*. CLSC CHSLD Haute-ville-des-rivières, Québec. Retrieved from <http://www.santecom.qc.ca/BibliothequeVirtuelle/CLSC-CHSLD-Haute-Ville-Des-Rivieres/ViolenceOrganisationnelle.pdf>
- [3] Castellot, A-S. (2019). *La reconnaissance au travail*. Communication présentée par le GRIEPS. Les berges du Rhône-64, avenue Leclerc, 69007 Lyon: Villeurbanne. [https://www.anfh.fr/sites/default/files/fichiers/portfilio\\_journee\\_econference\\_14.02.19.pdf](https://www.anfh.fr/sites/default/files/fichiers/portfilio_journee_econference_14.02.19.pdf)
- [4] Ren, D., Stavrova, O. & Loh, W. W. (2021). Nonlinear effect of social interaction quantity on psychological well-being: Diminishing returns or inverted U? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000373>
- [5] N'Guessan, K. S. P. (2016). *Le rôle du bien-être au travail dans l'influence des conditions de travail sur l'absentéisme: Une application aux fonctionnaires de Côte d'Ivoire*. Thèse de doctorat en Sciences de Gestion, Bouaké, Université Alassane Ouattara.
- [6] Bernard, N. (2019): *Bien-être au travail et performance de l'entreprise: une analyse par les paradoxes*. Thèse de doctorat en Gestion et management, Université Grenoble Alpes. Retrieved from <https://theses.hal.science/tel-02461337>
- [7] Grossen, M. (2018). Interaction ou inter-actions? Deux conceptions de la notion d'interaction. *Travaux neuchâtelois de linguistique*, 68, 121-128 [http://www.unine.ch/files/live/sites/tranel/files/Tranel/68/121-128\\_Grossen.pdf](http://www.unine.ch/files/live/sites/tranel/files/Tranel/68/121-128_Grossen.pdf)
- [8] Marc, E. & Picard, D. (2015). Conflit et relation. *Gestalt*, 1 (46), 129-142.
- [9] Errazuriz, J. A. (2020). La notion de l'ennemi dans le discours des philosophes: vers une taxonomie du concept. *Scienza et Politica*, 32 (62), 141-159.
- [10] Lignier, W. & Pagis, J. (2014). Inimitiés enfantines: l'expression précoce des distances sociales. *Genèse*, 3 (96), 35-61.
- [11] Diep, T. N. N., Teo, S. T. T., Grover S. L. & Nguyen, N. P. (2019). Respect, bullying and public sector work outcomes in Vietnam. *Public Management: Review*, 21 (6), 863-889.
- [12] Creusier, J. (2013). Clarification conceptuelle du bien-être au travail. France: Université de Caen Basse-Normandie (France), NIMEC EA 969. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/jordane-Creusier/publication/272301415\\_Clarification](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/jordane-Creusier/publication/272301415_Clarification)
- [13] Guillemin, F., Paul-Dauphin, A., Virion, J. M., Bouchet, C. & Briançon, S. (1997). The Duke Health Profile: a generic instrument to measure the quality of life to health. *Santé publique*, 9 (1), 35-44.
- [14] Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56 (3), 218-226.
- [15] Yaich, A. (2004). La courtoisie professionnelle. *La Revue Comptable et Financière*, n° 65, Retrieved from <https://www.larcf.com/edito/edito65.pdf>
- [16] Grover, S. L. (2013). Unraveling respect in organization studies. *Human relations*, 67 (1) 27-51.
- [17] Eiguer, A. (2022). Haine par l'autre, de l'autre, par soi, de (pour) soi. In A. Eiguer, *La haine de soi et de l'autre*, (p. 31-47). Paris, Dunod.
- [18] Jeantet, A. (2018). *Les émotions au travail*. Paris, Éditions CNRS.
- [19] Clarke, N. & Mahadi, N. (2015). Mutual Recognition Respect Between Leaders and Followers: Its Relationship to Follower Job Performance and Well-being. *Springer: Journal of Business Ethics*, 141 (1), 163-178,
- [20] Decker, C. & Van, N. Q. (2015). Getting Respect from a Boss You Respect: How Different Types of Respect Interact to Explain Subordinates' Job Satisfaction as Mediated by Self-Determination. *Springer: Journal of Business Ethics*, 131 (3), 543-556.