

CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Well-being Ill-being at Work

Guest editor

Nathalie Bernard

IAE de Lyon

Virginie MOISSON

Université de la Réunion

Calendrier prévisionnel

September 30, 2024

Submission deadline

November 30, 2024

Notification to authors

March 3, 2025

Submission of revised manuscripts

April 28, 2025

Final decision

May 26, 2025

Submission of final version

Comment soumettre ?

www.manuscriptmanager.net/ripco

Contact

contact@ripco-online.com

Article proposals can take multiple forms: systematic literature reviews, meta-analytical or bibliometric reviews synthesizing the available scientific knowledge on the subject, conceptual analyses proposing new theoretical frameworks, and, of course, empirical analyses conducted through experiments, questionnaires, or qualitative case studies, for example. The different facets of well-being and ill-being at work can be studied as such or in relation to their antecedents and/or consequences. In such cases, longitudinal studies will be preferred. The theoretical approaches used to support these contributions will mainly come from management sciences, particularly organizational behavior, or from disciplines such as psychology (including social psychology), ethnology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, political science, economics, information technology, etc.

Expected Contributions

Without being exhaustive, submissions may specifically address one or more of the following themes:

Relationships Between Well-being / Ill-being at Work

Advocates of positive psychology have long noted that the prevention and treatment of negative phenomena (e.g., stress, burnout) do not automatically lead to the emergence of positive phenomena (Carson & Barling, 2009). Initiating an upward spiral cannot rely solely on stopping negative dynamics (Roberts, 2006).

Well-being / Ill-being at Work

In life in general, it has been suggested that negative affects can coexist with positive ones: thus, uncertainty about the persistence of current happiness can be a source of anxiety, benevolence can expose one to the risk of exploitation, authenticity can penalize the quality of social relationships, and conversely, anger or stress can sometimes be energizing. Excessive kindness in workplace relationships could lead to overlooking certain dysfunctions and ultimately penalize the sustainability of the organization. How can the link or lack thereof between these psychological phenomena in the workplace be explained? How can the striking similarity between the managerial actions recommended in academic literature to combat ill-being and those suggested to develop well-being be explained? More generally, to what extent and under what conditions can workplace well-being be compatible with "societal ill-being" (wars, conflicts, crises, solastalgia, anxieties related to climate change)?

Personal and Collective Work Experiences

While well-being and ill-being at work have objective dimensions, they also constitute subjective individual constructs. These are feelings that are probably not governed by the same antecedents for all employees. What suits one person may not satisfy another. For example, the autonomy granted in job positions can be perceived as a source of fulfillment or, on the contrary, as a lack of organization and management. An employee's personal history, professional journey, current situation, personality, and expectations, as well as the quality of relationships within the work team, color these interpretations. In this context, the application of standardized managerial practices should not be recommended. There is a high probability that they will not influence positive and negative affects in the same way. Beyond the team manager, both well-being and ill-being at work seem to fall under collective responsibility, as they also depend on the quality of interaction between each member of the organization. Well-being at work

could, in this respect, have an allocentric dimension that is still largely overlooked in academic research. Various questions arise from these conjectures. Among them: Under what conditions can personal well-being at work converge with the collective well-being of the work team? How can managerial practices favorable to well-being be personalized without penalizing the sense of organizational justice? What are the underlying explanatory mechanisms of allocentric well-being and/or ill-being at work? Are there "contagion" and/or "trickle-down" phenomena in this regard?

Well-being/Ill-being in Management Sciences Educational Institutions

This thematic sector is dedicated to the specific case of the well-being/ill-being of teaching and research staff in higher education institutions of management sciences (Schools, Universities). Hyper-competitiveness and rapid internationalization for some, bureaucratization and pauperization for others have given rise to new forms of pressure on these personnel. Individual and collective resilience has become a sine qua non condition of sustainability in this sector. Although there is no national observatory at this level of study, like the one established in educational institutions (Bechichi and Blouet, 2023), numerous testimonies reveal a situation where professional vocation coexists with more or less latent ill-being. In this context, many areas of shadow deserve to be clarified: How can the ill-being of at least part of the teaching and research staff, whose status is envied by the general public, be explained? What are the positive and negative consequences of gender parity requirements on staff? Is the "publish or perish" principle a source of bad conscience for some and professional exhaustion for others? How can one position oneself to preserve their well-being? What individual defense mechanisms can be developed in the academic environment? Does job security in universities have its social dark side?

References

- Barley, S.R. & Kunda, G. (1992). Design and devotion: Surges of rational and normative ideologies of control in managerial discourse. *Administrative science quarterly*, 37(3), 363-399.
- Bechichi N. & Blouet L. (2023). Les leviers du bien-être au travail des enseignants du second degré - Les enseignements du Baromètre du bien-être au travail des personnels de l'éducation nationale. Note d'Information, n° 23.42, DEPP.
- Carson, J. & Barling, J. (2009). Work and well-being. In S.R. Clegg and C.L. Cooper (eds) *The Sage handbook of organizational behavior*. California: Thousand Oaks.
- Evans, P.A.L. (1999). HRM on the edge: A duality perspective. *Organization*, 6(2), 325-338.
- Genoud, C. (2023). Leadership, agilité, bonheur au travail. *Bullshit! En finir avec les idées à la mode et revaloriser (enfin) l'art du management*. Paris: Vuibert.
- Landsberger, H. A. (1958). *Hawthorne Revisited: Management and the Worker, Its Critics, and Developments in Human Relations in Industry*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University.
- Le Garrec, S. (2021). *Les servitudes du bien-être au travail*. Toulouse: Editions érès.
- Muldoon, J. (2017). The Hawthorne studies: An analysis of critical perspectives, 1936-1958. *Journal of Management History*, 23(1), 74-94.
- Roberts, L. M. (2006). Shifting the lens on organizational life: The added value of positive scholarship. *Academy of management review*, 31(2), 292-305.
- Seligman, M. E. (1999). The president's address. *American psychologist*, 54(8), 559-562.

Process and submission norms

Proposals must be submitted via our platform: <https://ripco.manuscriptmanager.net/ripco>. When submitting, authors must choose the special issue « Special Issue : Well-being at Work » from the drop-down menu in the field " If the manuscript is destined to a Special Issue, please make a choice" found in the "DETAILS" page of the submission. Proposals should follow the editorial standards of the journal: ripco-online.com/EN/avantSoumission.asp

All articles submitted to the journal are reviewed on a double-blind basis and all resubmitted manuscripts go through the same review process, and the previously solicited reviewers give an assessment based on consideration of the changes suggested in the first round of review. The final editorial decision will be made on the basis of the proposed revised manuscript, in the form of either an acceptance for publication or a final rejection, possibly with an invitation to resubmit for a regular issue of the journal.