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1 INTRODUCTION

Managing work and non-work is central for individuals’ well-being however to different extents and to different manners for diverse individuals. For organisations, managing work and non-work becomes central to the development of healthy organisations especially one considering individuals in the centre. To truly be a healthy but above all a sustainable and healthy organisation, it is essential to listen to every employee. It is thus central to understand individuals as unique "human resource" and therefor to understand human resources in their diversity. Diversity can be discussed in diverse terms among those cultural or biological. The diversity in focus in this paper is sexual orientation in terms of "homosexuality" especially "gay homosexuality". The aim of this paper is to problematise and potentially hypothesise gay work/non-work experiences to set a research agenda

This discussion is based on the accumulation of knowledge in the work/non-work life1 and the observation that the gay perspective in work-life tended to be forgotten whereas the society seems to give a place to these issues as the legalisation of the gay marriage is on the political agenda in several countries including the US, France and the UK recently. This discussion explores the extent to which the work/non-work experiences could be different just due to one’s sexual preferences of being gay.

The remaining of this paper is based on 4 parts. The first part of sets the stage for this discussion calling for a humanistic and then gay case in the work/life research. The second part presents a theoretical model focusing on individual's work/non-work experiences. The third part discusses this model from a gay perspective. A small conclusion is then offered.

2 A HUMANISTIC AND GAY CASE?

Balancing work and non-work is central for individuals’ well-being however to different extents and to different manners for diverse individuals. But the focus has been changing in research, from family to all organisational stakeholders as well as from conflict to more integration and enhancement perspective. These shifts are the starting point of this paper. I thus review here the development of the work/life research to set the stage for a humanistic and a gay case in the work/life research.

2.1 The development of the work/life research in 3 cases: business, ethical and responsible cases

In the work-life as a research field, research has been clearly framing work-life field matters as a women and family issues; family being defined then as two people of different sex with children. This is on that premise that the "business case" for work-family issue has been developed and popularised. This business case was reinforced in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s when women entered in a more massive and systematic way the labour market. Whereas practitioners perpetuate the myth of separate spheres, women find it difficult to assume multiple roles both at work and outside work, i.e. especially family-based roles. Women start to face the “double shift” syndrome (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Hochschild, 1989; Paoli & Merllié, 2001), making it hard to simultaneously accomplish a career and a family. The overall learning of this stream of research is a greater awareness that the work-family relationships are essential for individuals’ physical, psychological and social health in and outside the workplace (see Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Geurts & Demerouti, 2003; Poelmans, O'Driscoll, & Beham, 2005). Consequently, in the mid and late 1990’s, practitioners started to recognise that work and non-work, especially family, were interrelated and had an impact on organisational performance. Under overall social, economic, legal, institutional and individual pressures, organisations developed and implemented work-family policies (Goodstein, 1994; Poelmans & Sahibzada, 2004). The work-family relationships have become a central issue on the human resource management (HRM) agenda via work-family arrangements. Den Dulk (2005) defines work-family arrangements as “measures supporting working parents developed by employers” (den Dulk, 2005, p. 211). Glass & Finley (2002) distinguish three main types of options: 1- flexible work arrangements providing greater temporal and spatial flexibility without reducing the average hours worked, 2- facilitation of leave arrangement aiming at reducing work hours to provide time to spend outside work and 3- the provision of child care or support arrangement aiming at providing social support for parents on the workplace. Actually, a large panel of options exists, among them part-time, flexi-time, tele-working, compressed work week, parental leave, maternity leave, paternity leave or even on-site day care (see: den Dulk, 2005; Geurts & Demerouti, 2003; Kodz, Harper, & Dench, 2002). These diverse work-family policies are developed differently in organisations as well as in countries (den Dulk, 2005). As a whole, work-family policies help parenting employees to combine paid work and family responsibilities. They enable individuals to cope with multiple demands to limit work-to-family and family-to-work conflict as well as increase work/non-work

1 The paper is based on the reviews made by the research in his 13 years of work on work-life.
However, there have been conflicting results regarding work-family programmes particularly in the late 1990’s and beginning of the 2000’s. On the one hand, many employees have succeeded to better manage their relationships between work and family, especially in regard to spending more time at home with their family leading in some cases to higher satisfaction and less perceived stress (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2006). On the other hand, globally roughly 20% to one third of the employees report to suffer from a large work/non-work imbalance (Braza & Languilaire, 2002; Duxbury, Higgins, & Johnson, 1999; Eriksson, 1998; European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2004). In addition, some work-family solutions are not always positively related to a reduction of work- to-family and family-to-work conflicts (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006). These results question the effectiveness and the role of work-family policies (Sutton & Noe, 2005). This has led work-family scholars to unanimously conclude that having work-family friendly policies is not identical to being family-friendly and that the business case favours employer-friendly policies rather than “employee-friendly” policies. Indeed, the implementation of work-family policies rather than their sole adoption is central for their effectiveness at the individual, organisational and societal level (Kodz et al., 2002; Kossek, 2003; McDonald, Brown, & Bradley, 2005; Poelmans & Sahibzada, 2004). Numerous obstacles to taking up such options and to their effectiveness when implemented have been pointed out among them heavy workloads, the climate/culture in the organisation especially the reactions of the colleagues and/or the managers as well as the lack of knowledge about the existence of work-family options (Allen, 2001; Kodz et al., 2002; Kossek, 2003; McDonald et al., 2005). Kodz et al. (2002) and McDonald et al. (2005) mention specifically the restrictions concerning the availability of and access to such arrangements. In fact, work/family programs are mainly reserved to women especially women having children at home so that men as well as employees living outside the nuclear family scheme are rarely in the scope of the policies.

This points out the question of the ethical responsibility of the management towards every employee. It can indeed be seen that justice, equality and equity issues can be raised on how work-life options are granted to employees. What is central is that questions of ethics may affect the willingness of taking options and the effectiveness of taking such options by affecting the organisational climate for example. It is therefore in the interest of business to adopt work-family policies but the effectiveness of such programs depends on the ethical implementation of policies. Overall, work-family programs have to be fairly and openly adopted and implemented to enable employees facing work-family conflict to manage this conflict. This can be called an ethical case and it is nowadays framed within the corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Pitt-Catspouphes & Googins, 2005). Ollier-Malaterre (2009) refers to how HR managers may or may not frame work-life issues as social issues in comparison to business issues. Part of the idea of CSR asserts that corporations are not only any more accountable in front of shareholders, but also in front of a large group of stakeholders including employees, their families as well as the society at large. Pitt-Catspouphes and Googins (2005) conclude that:

“Casting work-family issues as social responsibility offers opportunities to redefine the horizons of the work-family agenda, to involve different stakeholders in the development and implementation of the agenda, and to increase business accountability for their actions” (Pitt-Catspouphes & Googins, 2005, p. 483)

Lewis and Cooper (1995) indicate that difficulties to manage work and non-work responsibilities influence the functioning of families and other members’ well-being especially kids. They point out that such difficulties may reduce community involvement and the quality of care families provide to the “elderly and vulnerable” (ibid., p. 294). Along these lines, it is thus to be emphasized that employers should aim at providing a workplace enabling meaning, structure, identity, self-respect of employees as well as material rewards. This may be possible beyond the work-family policies in considering work/non-work issues in this new workplace. Indeed, to meet some shortages of work-family and going often beyond the legal frame required, more general programs under the broad label of work-life programs have been introduced. These programs recognise that family is not the only dimension outside work but that there may be dimensions like “free” and “leisure” time (See Hyman & Summers, 2004). These programs also extent the access to a larger panel of employees such as men with paternity leave arrangements. In a sense, these new policies addresspart of the general changes of expectations towards life for men and women (see: Baudelot & Gollac, 2003; Bauer & Penet, 2005; Suzan Lewis & Cooper, 1995; Sturges & Guest, 2004). The work/non-work policies in the frame of CSR are partly built on the changes in managerial attitudes towards work/non-work issues as well as on the provision of options beyond the legal frame, i.e. the voluntary side of work-family arrangements (Trinczek, 2006).
Beyond such business, ethical and responsible aspects, one of the strong arguments of work-life programs is that work and non-work should be more integrated in order for individuals to balance multiple demands and experience less work/non-work conflict. Integration is the key word of the work-life programs. Integration is developed through formal flexibility gained, first, in the different types of working arrangements and, second, via initiatives included in work-life programs. In concrete terms, it is represented via part-time contract or tele-working agreement or by the disposal of childcare or gym equipment in the organisations’ facilities or even the encouragement to accomplish community activities via internal associations based on the competence of the firms. Integration is as well developed by informal flexibility enhanced by new forms of organising. Contemporary organisations are, indeed, based on flat organisations, team work, quality circle and project work involving individuals in and outside the formal boundaries of the organisation and beyond the hierarchical structure by focusing on the activities and processes rather than belongingness to specific units (Petrigrew & Massini, 2003). Such flexibility is supported by IT that often makes work “portable” i.e., available anywhere at any time (Kossek, 2003; Valcour & Hunter, 2005) even outside the office space and working hours. Consequently, the spatial and temporal definitions of work are losing part for their sense. In the context of work/non-work experiences, scholars claim that boundaries between work and non-work become blurry.

As a whole, the development of how work/non-work relationships and experiences have become a central research focus in what is today referred as the work/life field defined as “a focus on the relationship between work and personal life” (See Kossek & Lambert, 2005b, p. 515) where three cases may be visible, business, ethical and responsible cases. Firstly, the business case claims that organisations have business interests in taking into consideration the work/non- work relationships within their policies and practices. It introduces the idea of integration. Secondly, the ethical case claims that organisations have ethical responsibilities when adopting and implementing work/non-work initiatives so that such policies are not discriminative as segmentation policies may have formerly been. Thirdly, the corporate social responsibility case enlarges the positive impacts of the work-life initiatives to more stakeholders and to the society so that integration may as well be beneficial for the society and community. Overall, the three cases retrace a shift from segmentation to integration of the work and non-work domains assuming that integration helps and supports individuals in reducing their work/non-work conflict and increase their work/non-work balance. Nonetheless, the question is whether this shift towards integration is an answer to all individuals’ well-being?

2.2 A humanistic case
Contrary to scholars’ and practitioners’ primary expectations, integration may not solve the so-called work/non-work conflict. Friedman and Greenhaus (2000, p. 66) show that “evidence on role conflicts shows that establishing and maintaining boundaries between these two life domains is essential.” A clear distinction between work and personal life may be necessary for some individuals. In 1988, Hall and Richter (1988) already noticed this difference between the organisational viewpoints relayed by popular journals and the individuals’ beliefs:

“Surprisingly, while many of the remedies touted in the popular press entail greater integration of work and home (such as home-based employment), our findings indicate greater need of separation of the two domains.”(Hall & Richter, 1988, p. 213)

More recent research suggests that the segmentation and integration of work and non-work domains may be both negative and positive for individuals’ well-being and that this in fact depends on the individuals’ context. Kossek (2003, p. 14) for example says: “there may be times when setting boundaries between work and home and structure may be desirable.” As a consequence, current research insists on the importance of a fit between individuals’ preferences and the organisational response towards work/non-work to ensure the work-life programs’ effectiveness both at the individual and the organisational level (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Kossek et al., 2006; Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999; Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005; Sutton & Noe, 2005):

“Wanting and attaining a high degree of separation between work and family may signify effective management of the boundary between these domains. Effective management may facilitate role performance in both domains, which in turn should enhance well-being.” (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999, pp. 119-120)

Rothbard et al. (2005) hold that such fit is essential to job satisfaction and organisational commitment. They even show that incongruence between individuals’ desires and organisational policies have greater negative effects for
individuals seeking segmentation than for those seeking integration. In line with the discussion above, they thus conclude that

“Integrating policies have become increasingly popular in many organizations as mechanisms for tapping into the full potential of employee. To this end, companies have adopted numerous policies, practices, and amenities such as onsite childcare and gym facilities among others. These policies are intended to attract people to organizations and help current employees manage their multiple roles. However, these policies are also consistent with the goal of many organizations to maximize the productivity of employees. [...] Although these policies and practices may increase some individual’s satisfaction and commitment by helping them actively manage the boundary between work and nonwork roles, our study suggests that greater access to integrating policies may have drawbacks for some employees” (Rothbard et al., 2005, p. 255).

Wilson et al. (2004) qualitatively illustrate the same individual challenge for young professionals in the UK who fight against their organisational context to recreate boundaries lost in their overall working environment. Kossek et al. (2006, p. 363) also indicate that “as currently implemented, many flexibility policies can encourage one to adopt an integration strategy which may not support lower family-to-work conflict”. Kylin (2007) and (Kylin, 2008) indicate that home-based teleworkers have a need to re-established boundaries between the waged work and other home activities to “legitimise working home in relation to family, friends and neighbours” (Kylin, 2008, p. 185). Languilaire (2009) empirically show that the same individuals search for segmentation and integration for diverse purposes especially segmentation on daily term and integration on the long term. Therefore, it is imperative to consider, in research and practice, both segmentation and integration as complementary processes. It is also imperative to consider individuals’ differences with regard to work/non-work experiences. To be even more exact, in the context of corporate social responsibility, there is a necessity for organisations to “respect” individuals’ choices in terms of the extent to which they want to segment or/and integrate both domains (Geurts & Demerouti, 2003; Hall & Richter, 1988; Kirchmeyer, 1995).

“Therefore, the most promising strategy to reduce conflict and facilitate balance between both domains is to create a healthy and motivational workplace that respects workers who have responsibilities and interests outside the workplace that they consider important for their quality of life.” (Geurts & Demerouti, 2003, p. 308)

“Despite promotion of the integration response...early finding indicated a need for maintaining the gap between work and family...However, the findings do not suggest that organizations should adopt a separation response, but rather, a third type which can be termed “respect”. Respect refers to the employer acknowledging and valuing the non-work participation of workers, and committing to support it.”(Kirchmeyer, 1995, p. 517)

As a consequence, organisations have to value the diversity among their employees when it comes to their work/non-work experiences. The notion of balance, conflict, enrichment but nowadayys also the notions of integration and segmentation, practically remain individual and not be institutionalised into policies that cannot apply to each individual. Organisatin must aimg a become healthy in the terms of Browne who defines healthy organisation (2002, p. 206) as an organisation maximizing “the integration of the worker goals for well-being and company objectives for profitability and productivity” (2002, p. 206) thus putting individuals in the center. To truly be a healthy but above all a sustainable and healthy organisation, it is essential to listen to every employee and to what leads to their well-being among those what "their" meaning of "integration and segmentation" is. From a human resources perspective, it is central to understand individuals as unique "human resource" and therefore to understand human resources in their diversity. I argue that organisations but also researchers must focus on individuals for the sake of human interests and values as, after all, work/non-work is about one’s entire life and thus about being humane. Therefore, I call for a new case: a humanistic case for work/non-work experiences both in practice and in research where human relates to humanism as “a doctrine, attitude, or way of life centred on human interests or values” (Merriam-Webster). Be humanistic means will thus mean to focus on such human interests and values.

2.3 A gay case
By calling for a humanistic case, I wish to highlight that work/non-work programs, whatever form they may take, have not only been created, developed and implemented for the primary sake of business, nor for the primary sake of ethic, nor for the primary sake of being considered as socially responsible. Work/non-work programs ought to be implemented to enable individuals to realise themselves as individuals in their whole life. Such a humanistic case
will enhance further the creation of sustainable healthy organisations and society. For that, management teams and especially human resource (HR) managers in charge of work-life programs should take steps to apprehend all individuals’ work/non-work experiences in their individual, organisational and societal contexts. This requires paying due attention to all individuals and their individual experience in their diversity. I claim that from a humanistic viewpoint managers should listen, explore and understand individuals’ work/non-work experiences in their individual, organisational and societal contexts in their diversity. Diversity can be discussed in diverse terms among those cultural or biological. However, it is observable that most of research in the work-life field is based on a knowledge accumulated for heterosexual individuals.

The GLBT perspective, is largely less represented and one can see that starts to be even less discussed when looking at conferences where tracks for GLBT tend to disappear. Nevertheless, the society is changing as several countries now recognise the GLBT community as a new types of family. The recent legalisation of the gay marriage and/or the gay adoption in several US state as in France and the UK represent such shift. Recognizing the richness of the current knowledge in the work-life, it becomes legitimate to discuss about its relevancy for GLBT population. This remaining of this paper thus discusses whether there is any "gay work/non-work experiences". For that the next section of this discussion paper presents one theoretical perspective used a starting point of this paper namely the “individual’s experience work/non-work” model developed by Languilaire (2009). The following part discuss this model from a gay perspective

3 INDIVIDUALS’ WORK/NON-WORK EXPERIENCES

The work/non-work relationships have been conceptualised in diverse manners among especially conflict, balance and enrichment. In answering the humanistic case, Languilaire (2009) adopts a boundary perspective to develop a model on work/non-work experiences. This model is the starting point of this paper focused on the discussion of a gay case or not.

3.1 The boundary perspective

Two theories focusing on boundaries are portrayed in the work-life field, i.e. boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996) and work/family border theory (Clark, 2000). Both

“Address the construction of work-family boundaries as a complex interplay between employees' strategies and preferences, the social contexts in which they are embedded, and both the idiosyncratic and cultural meanings attached to work and family.” (Desrochers & Sargent, 2003, p. 5)

In their review of the work/non-work interface, Geurts and Demerouti (2003) notice that the work/family border theory, by extension the boundary perspective, was “quite general in its concepts and was, therefore, difficult to test empirically” (p. 288). More than half a decade later there is still a dearth of research attempting to empirically examine the boundary perspective. This makes discussion of an emerging perspective of research in the work-life field necessary. In the work-life field, the boundary perspective emerges from research on conflict, balance and enrichment (see for example Frone et al., 1992) where the idea of boundaries is already present. In that regards, it is essential to keep in mind that numerous research papers touch upon boundaries, nonetheless, only a handful of these specifically focus on boundaries and contribute to the emerging perspective. Six studies have been influential in the development of the boundary perspective in the context of work and non-work. These include those by Nippert-Eng (1996), Clark (2000), and Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate (2000), as well the work of Ahrentzen (1990) and Kossek, Noe & DeMarr (1999) and Hall and Richter (1988). Besides these studies, the boundary perspective as an emerging field is characterised by few studies published recently (see Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007; Stephan Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, 2005; Golden & Geisler, 2007; Kossek et al., 2005, 2006; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2006; Rothbard et al., 2005; Cohen (2008), de Man (2008), Kylin (2008) in Warhurst, Eikhof, & Haunschild, 2008; Wilson et al., 2004). Beyond the diversity of concepts and approach used in these different pieces of research, they all have the same focal point: work/non-work boundaries. These pieces of research in the work-life field covers numerous concepts and ideas among those: boundary work, boundary management, integration, segmentation, blurring temporal boundaries, spatial boundaries, behavioural boundaries, psychological boundaries, social boundaries, human boundaries, permeability, flexibility, strength, placement, transcendence, boundary management strategies and activities, centrality of domains, proactive boundary work, enactment of mental boundaries. They research presents several types boundaries and life domains and diverse mechanisms of management or relationships between them. These pieces of research tend to point toward the existence of a work/non-work process when individuals create life domains that give them a meaningful sense of life and life
domains that they feel capable to manage considering their contexts. Beyond the original theory of boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996) and work/family border theory (Clark, 2000), Languilaire (2009) defines based on an empirical qualitative studies at the individual level that the work/non-work process can be seen as composed of "boundary development" aiming at developing life domains and "boundary management" aiming at managing these life domains (Languilaire, 2009). Both represent pillars of the work/non-work process from a boundary perspective as in figure 1.

Figure 1: The two pillars of the work/non-work process (adapted from Languilaire, 2009, p. 430)

3.2 Experiencing work/non-work from a boundary perspective
In combining the boundary development pillar and the boundary management pillar, Languilaire (2009) develops a theoretical model of how individuals experience their work/non-work relationships while, in their diverse contexts, individual are developing boundaries leading to the development of several life domains based on first on individuals' preferences between integration and segmentation and second on the success of the management of boundaries and how individuals accumulate the learnings into their self-identity. Figure 2 represent, the model for individuals' work/non-work experiences.

Work/non-work self-identity & preferences as starting points of work/non-work experiences.
Languilaire (2009) considers individuals’ work/non-work self-identity as the starting point of individuals’ work/non-work experiences. Individuals’ work/non-work self-identity is how individuals integrate their work/non-work experiences in the understanding of themselves as individuals acting between their various life domains. Individuals’ work/non-work self-identity is developed through the understanding of one’s work/non-work preferences between integration and segmentation but above the understanding of one’s work/non-work preferences in relation to their origins. Languilaire (2009) points out that knowing one’s preferences is not as important as knowing why one has such preferences. The origins of work/non-work preferences become central to the management of boundaries. In that context, five elements are identified as origins of the work/non-work preferences, namely the work/non-work related event in one’s upbringing, one’s past work/non-work experiences, one’s understanding of one’s roles in their life domain and one’s sense of personality and sense of “oneself”. The latter five elements represent the social origins of the work/non-work preferences reinforcing the social dimension of preferences and tempering the individual dimension of preferences.

Preferences are social but not necessarily nor systematically related to gender, age or personality traits and other individual characteristics. Preferences can be distinguished into overall preferences and specific boundaries for each type of boundaries. The preference for few specific boundary types plays a central role in the determination of the overall preference. In other words, overall preferences are influenced by preferences for human boundaries and overall preferences are moderately influenced by preference for temporal and negative cognitive preferences. Additionally, individuals’ preferences are diversely explicit. Languilaire (2009) shows that individuals are always aware of their overall preferences but may be not aware of some of their specific preferences. The level of explicitness of specific and/or overall work/non-work preferences depends on two characteristics: self-awareness and outspokenness. Languilaire (2009) defines self-awareness as the extent individuals are self-aware of their overall or/and specific work/non-work preferences. Outspokenness refers to the extent individuals speak out their overall
or/and specific preferences to one-self and others. Both characteristics are combined so that five levels of explicitness can be identified, i.e. not revealed, implicit, moderately explicit, explicit and highly explicit.

Individuals’ work/non-work self-identity is interrelated with individuals’ work non-work preferences. Both aspects thus reinforce each other. Their combination represents the self-regulatory mechanism of individuals’ work/non-work experiences so that individuals’ work/non-work self-identity may affect the level of explicitness of specific or/and overall work/non-work preferences.

Five archetypes of work/non-work preferences
Languilaire (2009) defines five archetypes of work/non-work preferences emerging from combination of diverse level of segmentation, integration and explicitness for segmentation and integration. Such combination consists of a three-dimensional model of individual work/non-work preferences (in the down of the model). These archetypes are as follow:

• First, individuals with an overall preference for pushed integration strongly value integration, but recognise that a minimum segmentation is essential for some of their specific boundaries. Such overall preference is highly explicit.
• Second, individuals with an overall preference for pushed segmentation strongly value segmentation, but recognise that a minimum integration is essential for some of their specific boundaries. Such overall preference is highly explicit.
• Third, individuals with an overall preference for moderated integration value integration, but have natural segmentation preference for few of their specific boundaries. This overall preference is implicit.
• Fourth, individuals with an overall preference for moderated segmentation value segmentation, but recognise that integration is essential for some of their specific boundaries. Such overall preference is explicit.
• Fifth, individuals with an overall balanced preference value integration for some of their specific preferences and segmentation for other specific boundaries. Such overall preference is moderately explicit.

Individuals’ work/non-work process: Boundary work and boundary management
Based on their work/non-work preferences (on the three dimensional model), Languilaire indicates that individuals engage themselves in a work/non-work process that takes place in individual, organisational and societal contexts situating the development of one’s life domains. The work/non-work process is concerned with the flexibility and permeability of mental and concrete boundaries that are also dictated by the assigned goals of the domains. The flexibility and the permeability of mental and concrete boundaries are reached respectively via the boundary work process and the boundary management process deployed in work/non-work activities. Boundary work and boundary management may have diverse natures for the boundary work and boundary management processes which in turn can affect the overall nature of the work/non-work process. The nature of the boundary work and boundary management processes depends on one’s understanding of one’s individual, organisational and societal contexts and of the interrelations between mental and concrete boundaries.

On the one hand, Boundary work is defined as the process of placing and transcending mental life domains boundaries, i.e. the process of mentally rendering boundaries more or less flexible and permeable. Boundary work leads to the development of mental boundaries through mental daily and long-term work/non-work activities (sense-making). The boundary work process can be reactive, active, proactive, retroactive and passive:

• First, a reactive boundary work occurs when a boundary is externally set so that individuals decide to cope with it by modifying mental boundaries or creating new mental boundaries. In case the set boundary does not hinder one’s work/non-work experiences, reactive boundary aims at maintaining the concrete boundaries in line with the external boundary.
• Second, an active boundary work occurs when mental boundaries are created, maintained or modified at the same time as concrete boundaries.
• Third, a proactive boundary work occurs when mental boundaries are created, maintained or modified because a change has been foreseen.
• Fourth, retroactive boundary work occurs when mental boundaries are created, maintained or modified as a direct result of created, maintained or modified concrete boundaries.
• Fifth, passive boundary work occurs when mental boundaries are not intentionally created, maintained or modified in the frame of changes in one’s contexts or of dissonances between mental and concrete boundaries.

On the other hand, *boundary management* is defined as the process of placing and transcending concrete life domains’ boundaries, i.e. the process of concretely rendering boundaries more or less flexible and permeable. Boundary management leads to the development of concrete boundaries through concrete daily and long-term work/non-work activities. The boundary management process can be reactive, active, proactive and passive.

• First, a reactive boundary management occurs when a boundary is externally set so that individuals decide to cope with it by modifying concrete boundaries or creating new concrete boundaries. In case the set boundary does not hinder one’s work/non-work experiences, reactive boundary aims at maintaining the concrete boundaries in line with the external boundary.

• Second, an active boundary management can occur when concrete boundaries are created, maintained or modified at the same time as mental boundaries. An active boundary management also occurs when concrete boundaries are created, maintained or modified at the same time as ongoing changes where individual intentionally take part in their creation, maintenance or modification.

• Third, a proactive boundary management occurs when concrete boundaries are created, maintained or modified as a direct result of created, maintained or modified mental boundaries.

• Fourth, a passive boundary management occurs when concrete boundaries are not intentionally created, maintained or modified in the frame of changes in one’s contexts or of dissonances between mental and concrete boundaries.

Bearing the two processes in mind, it should be noticed that there is a relation between the level of explicitness of boundary and the nature of the process. In that regard, highly explicit preference leads more towards a proactive boundary work, explicit or moderately explicit preference leads towards an active or reactive boundary work and boundary management for specific preferences and implicit or not revealed preference leads more towards passive boundary work and/or boundary management. With the work/non-work self-identity affecting the level of preferences, Languilaire (2009) concludes that having a strong work/non-work self-identity will add more proactivity to the work/non-work process. The work/non-work self-identity will also affect the work/non-work activities (daily and long-term) that correspond to mental and concrete activities individuals engage in their work/non-work process.

*Individuals’ work/non-work process: from boundaries to life domains*

The outcomes of the work/non-work process are the mental and concrete boundaries that are, more or less, less permeable as well as, more or less permeable. The important dynamic is the alignment between mental and concrete boundaries through which life domains emerge. As a matter of fact, Languilaire (2009) indicates that when mental and concrete boundaries are aligned (cover the same thing) a domain emerge in terms of the boundary type in focus. When mental and concrete boundaries are not aligned, both domains concerned are blurry in terms of this boundary type. Through the combination of the diverse boundaries, diverse life domains emerge. These domains develop in individual, organisational and societal contexts in which the goals for each domain are embedded.

As a result, four main domains become central while considering individual’s work/non-work experiences: the work, the family, the social and the private:

• “The work” is a domain emerging in the context of relationships between one individual and one’s work based on providing a quality work as agreed upon between one individual, one’s employer but also colleagues.

• “The family” is a domain emerging in the context of relationships based on affection and love and enabling support between parts. It brings safety and love to one individual.

• “The social” is a domain emerging in the context of relationships between one individual and the people in one’s social environment imparting a sense of belongingness and friendship. It offers restoration and support to the individual.

• “The private” is a domain emerging in the context of seeking one’s own well-being and own development while performing activities for oneself and facilitating recovery. It enables individuals to disconnect from other domains and find a sense of personality and sense of oneself.
Individuals’ work/non-work process: sense of balance? conflict? enrichment?
The outcome of the work/non-work process as the constellation of these four domains is evaluated in the lens of one’s work/non-work self-identity and one’s work/non-work preferences. Languilaire (2009) reveals that this evaluation occurs in the context of the emergence of work/non-work emotions developed in the work/non-work process taken place in individuals’ individual, organisational and societal contexts. These work/non-work emotions indicate individuals how do they feel about their work/non-work process in their individual, organisational and societal contexts:

- Dissatisfaction with the work/non-work process is signaling by negative emotions relating to the idea of conflict.
- Satisfaction with the work/non-work process is signaling by positive emotions relating to the idea of enrichment.

In conclusion, Languilaire (2009) underlines that the work/non-work emotions are one principal driver of the work/non-work process leading to consider work/non-work process as an emotional process. They are integrated into one’s work/non-work self-identity by being memorised and internalised so that they serve as a catalyer for future work/non-work experiences. Negative emotions will lead to a work/non-work process focused on placement, whereas positive emotions lead to a work/non-work process focussed on transcendence.

4 DISCUSSION, A GAY EXPERIENCE
The individual’s work/non-work experiences model above emerges from a “heterosexual” perspective. In this section I hypothetically discuss consequences of this model in a gay context. These hypotheses are not theoretically driven as to the knowledge of the author no research adopting a boundary perspective has been done in the context of gay people. Few aspects are discussed from the author own understanding of being gay. These propositions are made to set some direction for empirical exploration and research to be conducted.

4.1 Any gay life domains?
First, the boundary perspective especially the boundary development pillar at it related concepts indicates that individuals are defining life domains among them the family, the work, the social and the private domains having all different purposes. When introducing a “gay” perspective the questions is: What are the life domain of the gay population? The constellation of life domains could be indeed be different for gay individuals especially when it comes to non-work domains, the family, the social and the private.

FAMILY: For some of them, the existence of family as “couple life” (see Languilaire, 2009) is not always socially possible either due to societal pressure or to more individual pressure. Family cultural value and maybe religion belief in which people have been raised in does not allow the same view of “couple life”. The existence of family is “extended family” may be different as for some the “rejection” from their own family (parents etc) may mean a lack familial support and no such traditional “family” domain. The existence of family as “children life” is also not socially and even more non legally possible in most countries. There is however new trend where gay people are having children with lesbian couples and sharing custody. This trend is indeed visible in Sweden even if not legally to adopt children. Several research on gay parenting would enable to support the particularity of this domain. For “late” out people, the idea of children may be associated with the former heterosexual relationship which also will ask other work/non-work activities for it to be handled. The idea of family may be redefined with extreme close relations between people who can give love and emotional support. It can be seen as “mentorship” between specific people who may have developed from a social relation. The recent changes in society with legalisation of gay marriage will affect the definition of families and the relations to parenting for gay people.

SOCIAL: When family may be reduced to null, social for gay people may be central. First, I believe that the social domain in the same sense as for heterosexual population where having friends will enable to get support. Second, I believe that this domain may take for some of the gay population a new turn in the form of “community” as a specific social network among people who share the same sexual orientation. The development in major city of "gay" quarters, like Soho in London, Le Marais in Paris or Darlinghurst in Sydney are the spatial development of such social network that becomes central and also are mixing with work. The centrality of the sense of community that may be strong for gay people may lead to new demand in managing their life domains and life as whole. It may be

2 Note that it seems more socially for Lesbians couples to have own children and this is biologically possible.
socially required to socialise in the community to be seen, accepted as gay as well as to develop as gay people. Indeed, there may be a social pressure to "act" gay and not reproduce heterosexual scheme so that engaging in community and community rights is required and not doing so may be seen as "counter-performant". In France, observing the debate about gay marriage and reactions in blogs has indeed showed me such attitude.

PRIVATE:
The difficulties faced by some gay men may request a strong private time for reflection about themselves making "personal life" or "private life" central domains. As private but in interaction with the social, gay people are often described as "training" people taking care of themselves and their well-being. Here again this view in Sweden is largely shared.

WORK. When it comes to work, a specificity of the gay population is "self-employment" and creative work as underlined by Florida in terms of creative classes. It is indeed visible on social network where people indicate their status that most are self-employed. It is also visible again in the ownership of businesses in the "gay quarters" that are driven by gay people.

All in all this start of discussion pinpoints to a need of exploration of the "gay life domains". From my gay eyes, I would like more research looking at the following gay constellation.

4.2 Gay work/non-work preferences and gay archetypes?
Based on the individual’s work/non-work experiences model above, it becomes central that work/non-work preferences are social so that one’s social context (individual, organisational and societal) influences one’s preferences in terms of level of integration, segmentation and explicitness.

When introducing a “gay” perspective the first question is: How do gay people wish to integrate and segment their life domains? The preferences being social, the level of acceptance of gay lifestyle in the society will be decisive in the extent to which integration may be wished. In accepting environment (individual, organisational, societal), integration may be more socially accepted so that wanted to be open and authetic in all in all domains may be a preferences. On the contrary, in less accepting environment, segmentation may be more natural when not imposed or legally inforced.

When introducing a “gay” perspective the first question is: To what extent their work/non-work preferences can be explicit (self-aware and outspoken). Indeed the level of explicitness may be central for gay population. Whereas the awareness about preferences has not reason to be related with sexual orientation, the level of outspokenness of integration or segmentation may be. Here again the difference will be between accepting or non-accepting environment at the societal, organisational and individual levels where in the later outspokenness will be largely social discouraged. In accepting environment, individuals may have more control over the level of outspokenness of their preferences and may decide freely of segmenting, this would make gay people no different from heterosexual who want to segment.
4.3 A gay work/non-work boundary work and management?
As a matter of fact, not being openly gay may be the result of choice or a structural factor. On the one hand, for people who are "by choice" not openly gay, segmentation may be an essential preference that they enacted proactively. Integration that is today's emerging norm may be thus challenging for "by choice" not openly gay as it can be associated with the experience of the coming out. For people who are "by constraint" not openly gay, “segmentation” becomes a strategy that is socially imposed so that individuals must perform a different boundary management in comparison to heterosexual.

I believe that the direction of the interaction between work and non-work (see family-to-work and work-to-family research) may be central to consider for gay people where the asymmetry may be essential and entertain by few gay people. Whereas they may have as much as work to non-work interference when employed as one may follow the "Heterosexual" norms when not open, the non-work to work will be reduced when not open. When open, few elements could tend to see that gay people are more available to take work home so that work to non-work interference can be high, but some non-work to work can be socially accepted. In the case of "accepting" society, non-discrimination will make that gay will or should experience the same types of work/non-process when having "children".

From this discussion, I foresee some differences in terms of work/non-work process between gay and heterosexual population but not clear proposition can be naturally drawn unless it regards to the nature of the process that depends again of the environment being accepting or not.

4.4 Are gay people experiencing high quality or low quality work/non-process?
Work/non-work emotions will be experienced in the way by the gay population, but when being in a non-accepting environment may lead to negative emotions when individuals would love to integrate their domains. The feeling of not being authentic and the in-depth emotional dissonance that can be associated by denying one's identity may lead to really poor quality of the work/non-process. The negative work/non-work emotions that are associated with work/non-work conflict may be a reason why self-employment is seen as an alternative to re-established an equilibrium.

4.5 Any gay work/non-work self-identity?
When it comes to "self-identity", I believe that cultural factors affecting how roles and expectations have been learned may be central in gay people work/non-work identity. If traditional roles have been enforced, this may have an impact towards work/non-work preferences towards segmentation. When no traditional roles have been enforced but when respects of lifestyles has been learned, it may be easier to integrate and this may be just seen as natural. Previous work/non-work experiences will have a similar effect on gay people as they have on heterosexual people. However, I believe that gay people may relate to a "gay" related childhood event as one of the constructive event of their work/non-work identity.

5 CONCLUSION: SETTING A RESEARCH AGENDA
With all warnings apart, as most of the current proposition must be developed further and shall be more anchored in research, I would however like to conclude using my eyes as a work/non-work researcher and as a gay guy living in Sweden (accepting society) and having a French background (a less accepting society) that one key that makes a difference between gay and heterosexual is the social acceptance of gay life style or not. I believe that when in a non-accepting environment, work/non-work process in terms of boundary development and management will be different for gay people, but when in a accepting environment, work/non-work process in terms of boundary development and management will be similar for gay people as this will enable them to render them freedom of choices as for heterosexual.

This paper is, at the present stage, a working discussion paper and I ought to take it to another level connecting current research on gay people in different domains to discuss the differences in depth. I would also like to collect more empirical material both secondary and primary data.

I however believe that the questions raised are legitimate and must be explored in a more systematic way.