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INTEGRATING AND SEGMENTING
AN ESSENTIAL COMBINATION TO REACH WORK/NON-WORK BALANCE

This paper shows that integrating and segmenting are complementary processes in individual’s work/non-work experiences. This paper is based on individuals’ self-narratives of 6 French middle-managers. This paper analyse qualitatively integrating and segmenting as work/non-work preferences and as work/non-work activities. It reveals that segmenting and integrating are experienced as two parallel strategies. Reaching long-term integration between one’s life domains is a long-term process essential to one’s work/non-work balance. However, such long-term objectives require in our contemporary and integrative society to daily segment some central work/non-work activities by drawing some of our boundaries more clearly on daily and short term. Their complementarities renders complexity to the segmentation-integration continuum leading to consider five archetypes of individuals in regard to their work/non-work experiences.
INTEGRATING AND SEGMENTING
AN ESSENTIAL COMBINATION TO REACH WORK/NON-WORK BALANCE

1. INTRODUCTION
In 1996, Nippert-Eng defined segmentation and integration as opposite while introducing the segmentation-integration continuum represented in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: The segmentation-integration continuum (Based on Nippert-Eng, 1996)]

This view is anchored in how the relationships between work and non-work have so far been addressed in organisations, i.e. by practitioners as well as studied in the work-life field. Whereas in the 1980s work shall be separated from non-work (Hall & Richter, 1988), the change in demography and the access to the workplace by women in the mid and late 1990s opened the discussion on integrating work and non-work. 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 thus 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). This is the development of a "business case" claiming that organisations have business interests in taking into consideration the work/non-work relationships within their policies and practices. Today, the corporate social responsibility case (Pitt-Catspouphes & Googins, 2005) enlarges the positive impacts of the work-life initiatives to more than women and to the society so that integration may as well be beneficial to the community. Overall, the literature within the work-life field can be structured over a shift from segmentation to integration work and life integration helps and supports individuals in reducing their work/non-work conflicts and increasing their work/non-work balance. Nowadays, such integration is facilitated by IT which literally makes work portable, thus accessible anywhere and anytime (Valcour & Hunter, 2010). Consequently, I would claim that we live in an “integrative society” where integration become some sort of a social norm by which it is possible to live.

Beyond this integrative view, few studies point out that individuals crave for segmenting their life domains. Friedman and Greenhaus (2000) indicate that “evidence on role conflicts shows that establishing and maintaining boundaries between these two life domains is essential” (p. 66). In 1988, Hall and Richter already noticed this difference between the integrative viewpoints 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.” (p.213). Kossek (2003, p. 14) also says: “there may be times when setting boundaries between work and home and structure may be desirable.” More recently, Kylin (2007, 2008:185) indicates 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”. Wilson et al. (2004) indicate that UK young professional fight against their organisational context to recreate boundaries lost in their overall working environment.

This leads to the conclusion that the integrative context may not solve the so-called work/life or work/non-work conflict at the individual level so that individuals feel a need to reshape work/non-work boundaries: “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). But what is “an effective management of the work/non-work boundaries”. It is about segmenting OR integrating one’s domains or is it about segmenting AND integrating?

The aim of this paper is to understand the roles of the segmenting and integrating processes in individual’s work/non-work experiences. This paper contributes to the work-life field research by bringing back an individual perspective do that the humanistic challenge in the centre of the work/non-work relationship can be addressed.

The remainder of this paper is thus structured as follow. In the second part of this paper, a theoretical understanding of the work/non-work process is providing. Third, the methodology as narrative approach and its application in the fieldwork are presented. It explains how self-narratives of 6 middle-managers have been generated. In part four the 6 self-narratives are presented. Part five and six represent a discussion about the segmenting and integrating process respectively as preferences and as activities using empirical illustrations from individuals' work/non-work self-narratives. Conclusions are made in part seven whereas implications and contributions are exposed in part eight.

2. THE WORK/NON-WORK PROCESS
Segmenting and/or integrating life domains is based on two interrelated processes namely boundary work and boundary management which together refer to the work/non-work process. Boundary work has mainly been seen as a proactive process (see Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000, Nippert-Eng, 1996 #1; Kossek, Noe, & DeMarr, 1999) so that the individual is able to foresee changes in his/her situation and, a priori, mentally change the boundaries concerned so that they fit his/her work/non-work preferences and contexts. Boundary management comes second and takes place according to these new mentally defined boundaries (see Ashforth, et al., 2000; Kossek, et al., 1999; Lambert & Kossek, 2005) so that new concrete boundaries are shaped. In other words, in a proactive work/non-work process, mental boundaries are changed first according to one’s work/non-work preferences. Then mental boundaries are concretised in one’s individual, organisational and societal contexts via what could be called work/non-work activities. A proactive process can be represented as in figure 2:

![Figure 2 - Proactive process to manage boundaries](image)

In line with this process, an individual creates, develops and maintains consecutively mental and concrete work/non-work boundaries aiming at segmenting and/or integrating in line with his/her preferences for segmenting and/or integrating. In this paper focusing on segmenting and/or integrating, two aspects become central. First, segmenting and/or integrating as work/non-work preferences emerge as individuals’ preferences. Second, as preferences are thereafter acted upon by individuals considering their individual, organisational and societal contexts, the creation, development and maintenance of mental and concrete boundaries, reveal the purpose of segmenting and integrating. Consequently, to understand the role of segmenting and integrating for individuals’ work/non-work experiences, which is the aim of this paper, both aspects must be discussed. The two following sections review segmenting and/or integrating respectively as preferences and as part of boundary work and management.

Segmenting and/or integrating as work/non-work preferences
Kossek et al. (2005, p. 351) touch upon what could be seen as preference in regards to work and family indicating that

“everyone has a preferred, even if implicit, approach for meshing work and family roles that reflects his or her values and the realities of his or her lives for organising and separating role demands and expectations in the realms of home and work”. (2005, p. 351)

Zerubavel (1997) also touches upon the notion of preference when discussing social mindscapes which help social beings to perceive, enter, organise the social world in a similar way. Zerubavel (1991) defines two main types of mindscapes. One the one hand, there is the “rigid mind” by which one defines strict lines because one does not accept a mixture and wants to avoid it. On the other, there is the “fuzzy mind” by which one defines no lines and does not distinguish any categories, making fluidity of mind possible. Zerubavel's social mindscapes are equivalent respectively to segmenting and integrating preferences. They are at the origin of the segmentation-integration contribution developed by Nipper-Eng (1996) as she shared this view while conceptualising home and work. They also underline different roles for each of them.

Overall, this suggests that the segmentation-integration continuum could indeed be considered as a mirror of such work/non-work preferences. Bulger et al. (2007) clearly explore such possibility using a sample of 332 participants in 24 organisations. They finally describe four clusters defining work/non-work segmentors, work integrators & non-work segmentors, work/non-work integrators or segmentors in the middle of the continuum and, finally work/non-work segmentors close to the segmentation extreme but not at the extreme. Bulger et al.’s studies empirically indicates thus that the entire continuum could reflect work/non-work preferences so that "effective management" is more than a segmenting or integrating view and could be a "segmenting AND integrating" view.

Segmenting and/or integrating in boundary work and boundary management

In line with the proactive process presented above, having a certain preferences individuals will, considering possibilities and constraints in their individual, organisational and societal contexts, develop mental and then concrete boundaries. Languilaire (2009) indicates that individuals develop up to seven types of boundaries for which each nature (mental or concrete) can be defined as in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial boundaries</td>
<td>The rules established regarding the use of space as work and/or non-work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal boundaries</td>
<td>The rules established regarding the use of time as work and/or non-work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human boundaries</td>
<td>The rules established regarding how relationships are seen part of work and/or non-work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional boundaries</td>
<td>The rules established regarding how emotions relate to work or non-work as well as dictating how emotions related to one domain go from one domain to another and may be displayed in each domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural boundaries</td>
<td>The rules established regarding how behaviours and attitudes relate to work and non-work as well as dictating how behaviours and attitudes related to one domain affect and are affected by behaviours from another domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive boundaries</td>
<td>The rules established regarding what positive and negative thoughts belong to work or non-work as well as dictate how thoughts related to one domain affect other domains and may be expressed in each domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosomatic boundaries</td>
<td>The rules established regarding how energy and strain related to one domain go from one domain to another and may be physically displayed in each domain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The definition in grey corresponds to the mental nature of the boundary
** The definition in white corresponds to the concrete nature of the boundary

These boundaries are built to enable individuals to organise their life domains so that they can enact their preferences. Boundary work and management are thus purposive so that segmenting and/or integrating are purposive. For Ashforth et al. (2000), individuals would choose to segment to minimize blurring of roles and to integrate to facilitate boundary role crossing. This relates to the two underlying mechanisms behind boundary work and boundary development namely placement and transcendence. Whereas these
mechanisms are originally developed for the boundary work process (see Nippert-Eng, 1996; Zerubavel, 1991, 1997), they are nonetheless applicable to the boundary management process. Through placement one defines a line between the domains and through transcendence one keeps the boundaries fixed so that one can cross them back and forth (Nippert-Eng, 1996). First, in the case of placement and transcendence of mental boundaries both mechanisms then refer to the boundary work process. Placement and transcendence are thus mental processes enabling the process of boundary work. Second, in the case the placement and transcendence of enacted boundaries, both mechanisms then refer to the boundary management process. Placement and transcendence are thus enactment processes enabling boundary management. Table 2 summarises the definitions of both mechanisms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Through placement one defines a mental and/or enacted boundary between the domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>Through transcendence one keeps mental and/or enacted boundaries fixed so that one can cross them back and forth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both processes may take place at a macro level, e.g. how one creates, maintains and changes boundaries when going to retirement, or at a micro level, e.g. how one commutes between the office and home every day (see Ashforth, et al., 2000). They also relate to each domain via what Nippert-Eng (1996) refers to as the three domains’ components: 1- people participating in the domain, 2- objects and ambiances of surroundings belonging to the domains, and 3- thoughts, activities associated with how one presents him(her)self in a specific domain (see Nippert-Eng, 1996, p. 8). These mechanisms influence “Who” may belong to one domain or more, what objects and ambiance will be similar in the different domains, and the way one will think, act and present oneself in the different domains (Nippert-Eng, 1996). These mechanisms relate to the flexibility and permeability of boundaries. Placement relates to flexibility because it may affect the exact placement of the boundaries (see Nippert-Eng, 1996). The relations to permeability are essential for the processes of boundary work and boundary management. Indeed, if a boundary is more permeable, the processes of boundary work and boundary management aim at drawing the border more clearly (placement) and if a boundary is less permeable, both processes aim at keeping the borders in place (transcendence) (see Nippert-Eng, 1996).

To put it briefly, it is central to consider placement and transcendence both as mental and enactment mechanisms to understand how life domains are segmented and/or integrated or how individuals are segmenting and/or integrating. When placement and transcendence are discussed for concrete boundaries, they relate to what has been named, work/non-work activities. In line with Kossek, Noe, and DeMarr (1999) one can define work/non-work activities can be seen as the visible and practical activities enabling an individual to concretely place and transcend boundaries or in turn to render boundaries more or less permeable and/or flexible. It is through such concrete work/non-work activities that the aim of segmenting and/or integrating is social shared during any social interactions. Listening and understanding such activities becomes thereof central to understand the roles of integrating and/or segmenting.

3. A NARRATIVE APPROACH
This paper is part of an in-depth qualitative analysis of 13 French middle-managers’ self-narratives about their work/non-work experiences (see Languilaire, 2009) which are thus referred as “work/non-work self-narratives”. France is the setting of the study. This choice is first made so that the researcher can better access the narration and the narrative of the storytellers as far as both share the same language and cultural background. Second, France is a relevant empirical setting. French people live in an integrative work/non-work context where they may be challenged in developing healthy work/non-work experiences. In France, 40% of the working active population report that their working conditions make the relationships between work and family difficult to manage (Garner, Meda, & Senik, 2004). It is also shown that the role of work in the French society may be changing where other life domains such as social life or personal life are found to be more important (Garner, Meda, & Mokhtar, 2004; Thévenet, 2004).
The « loi d'orientation et d'incitation à la réduction du temps de travail » passed by the French parliament in 1998 was partly presented as a work-family initiative. The reduction of working time to 35 hours per week has caused some employees more complex relationships balancing work and family (Coutrot, 2006). Moreover, the 35-hour act participates, to a certain degree of structural change, in the flexibility of the work domain from a temporal viewpoint. It is worthwhile to point out that from 1994 to 2004, the working time in France has decreased 3 hours weekly (see as an example Bally, 2006). This reduction of work is also associated with an overall reorganisation of work. The new organisation of work may affect the placement of boundaries due to higher flexibility of the working time and the permeability and transcendence of the boundaries due to the introduction of new technologies impacting work conditions (Afsa & Biscourp, 2004; Bué, Hamon-Cholet, & Puech, 2003; Coutrot, 2006). Finally, the changes in individuals’ life domains are increasing, resulting in to a boundary work and boundary management, in other words a new work/non-work process (Clark, 2000). The 35-hour act that changed the temporal boundaries between work and non-work (see Genin, 2008) may have prompted individuals to engage in a new boundary work and a new boundary management. Middle-managers have been also selected in regards to the setting of this study. What is vital here is the selection of individuals whose boundary work may be clear and better marked. In that regard, research shows that taking up a middle-management position reinforces negative impacts on external activities, especially family activities (Thomas & Dunkerley, 1999). Middle-managers may experience more tensions between work and non-work (see Kossek, 2003). The reason may be their changing roles (see Engel, 1997). Additionally, focusing on middle-managers is empirically interesting as they are in a dual position in organisations in terms of work/non-work experiences. Having more HR responsibilities or accountability towards their teams, middle-managers may be engaged in decisions affecting the work/non-work experiences of their teams. Poelmans (2005, p. 452) expresses such situations as follow:

“There is a special need for theory and empirical research focusing on managers because they have a pivotal role in firms as victims of the work-family conflict, as decision-makers in the allowance of policies to individuals, and as change agents in the effort to create more family-supportive firms” (Poelmans, 2005, p. 452)

It is in that regards that it becomes central for them to understand their own work/non-work experiences as far as they may affect their attitudes towards work/non-wok decisions.

As a whole, French middle-managers have been contacted as individuals and directly to their private address. Most have been randomly selected from a French business school alumni repertoire and others have been selecting a snowball sampling. In this paper, six individuals narrate their work/non-work experiences. Table 3 summarises their main personal and professional characteristics of the storytellers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Main position*** &amp; team</th>
<th>Size and Scope</th>
<th>Type of organisation*****</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Has a boyfriend</td>
<td>Madel</td>
<td>Director of International relationship &amp; 1 pers.</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>Work in Madel but have private life in Maname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thibault</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>Lansa</td>
<td>Project manager for quality</td>
<td>Large National</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Obtained fixed position in Jyve in early 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Sagasse</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Large International</td>
<td>Manufacture of chemicals, chemical products and man-made fibres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>In a distant relationship</td>
<td>Pign</td>
<td>Communication Manager</td>
<td>Large National but</td>
<td>Electricity, gas and water supply</td>
<td>Work as a project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The law promulgating orientation and incentives for the adoption of the new working time also called the “35-hour act” (loi des 35 heures) or “Aubry's Act” (Loi Aubry). It regulates the working time to 35 hours per week which was proposed by Martine Aubry, Minister of Work and Solidarity (1997-2001) (Ministre de l’Emploi et de la Solidarité). The act has been presented among others as a way to combine work and non-work and increase non-work time for higher well-being to also allow for better welfare and affluence. This law was review in 2000 and is currently being revised under the new French presidency which came to power in 2007.
This research relies on self-narratives where voices of storyteller him/herself in focus compared to more traditional narrative studies where micro stories from multiple narrators such as family members or work colleagues. This is close to the idea of Riessman (1993, p. 2) indicating that “individuals construct past event in personal narratives to claim identities and construct lives” so that they become “autobiographical narratives by which they tell their lives”. Self-narratives bring about the recounting of personal experiences as a way for individuals to make sense of their lives as stories (Ruth & Vilkko, 1996). Self-narratives like narratives are interpretative constructions of meaningful sequences of constructed facts in a certain place and time. In other words, individuals interpret their experiences and translate them into a narrative that is communicated in a talk through a certain narration. In the context of work/non-work experiences, by asking individuals to talk about their life, they start to construct a certain narrative about their life domains, about their relationships as segmented and/or integrated domains and the processes to reach such segmentation and/or integration. Individuals make sense of their work/non-work experiences by emploting their experiences, in time and place. Focusing on self-narratives reveals thus the work/non-work process of creating, managing and maintaining work/non-work boundaries especially preferences and activities (see Languilaire, 2009).

As field text, self-narratives have been generating between 2005 and 2006 during a series of active interview (Holstein and Gubrium (1995; 2002). The objective of active interviewing is described as follows:

“The objective is not to dictate interpretation but to provide an environment conducive to the production of the range and complexity of meanings that address relevant issues, and not to be confined by predetermined agendas.” (James A. Holstein & Gubrium, 2002, p. 120)

During the active interview, both participants are source of knowledge. The researcher’s role is to intentionally provoke responses and activate the respondent as source of knowledge. The role of the researcher is not only to interpret what is said (the content of the conversation) but also to interpret how the answers are constructed. In this research the series of active interview (see table 4) as presented in table 4 was based on understanding individuals life domains and how they are drawing boundaries and why. Interviews was based on concepts central to the boundary perspective such as domain, flexibility, permeability, preferences, placement and transcendence. The interview enabled to explore individuals’ experience from a past, present and future perspective to understand better how boundaries are created, developed and maintain over time. Segmenting and/or integrating have been in focussed during the last interview during which individuals have been asked to realise they “life puzzle” by placing different pieces representing their life domains over each other or not. The use of such tool facilitated individuals to develop their work/non-work self-narratives. The realisation of their ideal puzzle concretises also their work/non-work preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Full-time Position</th>
<th>Company Size</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Year of Appointment</th>
<th>Position Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brune</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1 son (20) and 1 daughter (16)</td>
<td>Director of International relationships</td>
<td>Medium International</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Become full time Director in January 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geremy</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3 boys (9, 7, 5)</td>
<td>Commercial Director for French retail market</td>
<td>SME National</td>
<td>Manufacture of chemicals, chemical products and man-made fibres</td>
<td>Changed company and position in June 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These are pseudonyms.

** At the date of first interview (September / October 2005)

*** Every city is a fictive name and represent city between 250 000 to 500 000 inhabitants. Sagasse is a large city with more than 1.5 million inhabitants.

**** The formulation is broad but reflects the content and level of the position.

The interview series was supplemented with the use of qualitative diaries. Diaries are one of the methods noted by Balogun, Huff and Johnson (2003) to be useful in order to increase the depth, breadth and diversity in management research. Diaries enable researchers to capture personal self-reflection in a more flexible way. Diaries make it possible to generate more personal as well as emotional reflection and individuals’ view on events they experience (see Balogun, et al., 2003). Few issues must be considered while using diaries especially the level of structure in the diary and the frequency of reporting (Balogun, et al., 2003; Lepp & Ringsberg, 2002). In this research, diaries are unstructured and they were written mainly in two consecutive weeks in the fall 2005. This design helped to grasp the context over the two weeks so that micro stories did not need to be repeated. It also alleviated the element of demotivation that accompanies such tasks when they are conducted over longer periods of time. In the fall of 2006, storytellers were asked again to write a diary over one week. This was to observe boundary work and boundary management at a time the domain might have changed. This might have helped giving an appropriate construction about the flexibility of the domains. Diaries have been word- or hand-written. The choice of format was left to the storytellers. In addition to these two large diaries, storytellers completed four days of diary. For that I picked out randomly four days between March and June 2006. On each day one diary page was sent out by email. The storytellers should then fill "Today, I..." and was presented in the follow way:

"Describe your day, give your opinion, and comment on how you have managed/conducted your relationships between your activities and responsibilities related to work, family and other personal domains. You can talk about how you managed your relations between your activities. You can concentrate on one or two aspects, positive or negative, during your day significant for your well-being or equilibrium between these activities".

Complementary questions were raised a week later. The aim was to provoke a reflection over the past week (weekly dairy in 2005 and 2006), day (daily dairy of spring 2006), on what was done in a satisfying way, what the storytellers would have liked to redo and what was the most satisfying and the most difficult time. In addition, storytellers were to freely write everything they ought to share and see as important for their work/non-work experiences.

Self-narratives have been interpreted at first during the intense interaction between the researcher and the storytellers, in practical terms during the interview situation when field text has been generated. Second it has been occurred when the researcher has a larger role in the generation of the narratives because the field text is analysed, understood, interpreted in the light of the research purpose and theoretical framework leading to generate research text. Once the field text is transcribed, I concentrated on one storyteller at a time. Transcripts have been read over and over. Tapes were also listened to reconnect with the context and be aware of the way the story was told. Notes were taken while listening again to the tapes. This helped me delve into each story and its context. It also enabled me to reconnect on how the co-interpretation was done during the interview situation. Once I felt that I have comprehended the story

---

2 The use of « manage and conduct » is in the context of the diary more concrete than experience.

3 "Aujourd'hui, je ..." : Décrivez votre journée, donnez votre opinion et commentez les manières dont vous avez mené vos activités et responsabilités au travail, dans votre famille, ou dans vos autres activités personnelles Vous pouvez parler de comment vous avez géré vos relations entre vos différentes activités. Vous pouvez vous concentrer sur un ou deux moments, positifs ou négatifs, de votre journée qui ont été significatifs pour votre bien-être.
in order to be connected with the context, I began coding the material to reduce the data in the light of the boundary framework. The coding was a way to go back to the theoretical framework and detach myself from the story. As Clandinin and Connelly (2000) recommend, the coding was made using a Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis System (CAQDAS) (Weitzman, 2000). Nvivo provided great help in reducing and organizing the field text as well as for the process of conducting the interpretation (Weitzman, 2000).

4. SIX WORK/NON-WORK SELF-NARRATIVES
In line with Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) advice on the alignment of format between field text and research text, my narrative approach and method lead to the redaction of self-narratives as research text. Using self-narratives as research text should enable to access the individuality in each narrative to understand each storyteller, their situation and thus their work/non-work experiences. The narrative form should enable the readers to emplot their own narratives and transfer the knowledge to their own context. The work/non-work self-narratives of Marine, Thibault, Sarah, Paul, Brune and Geremy are presented in the following vignettes. In each self-narrative, the overall plot of the narratives is given by the research. In that regards, the self-narratives below first present the storytellers and their overall context. It then focused storytellers’ work/non-work preferences and work/non-work activities. Quotes from the original self-narratives are indicated in italic where original plot is kept.
My name is Marine. I am working in Madel, a city three hours from Maname where I have been studying for couple of years and where I met Matthieu, my boyfriend. We are between both cities now. Generally, I have developed the impression that it is required to blend work and personal life. However, personally I draw barriers between my work and non-work domains on a daily basis. I do not like to talk about private matters at work. I may talk a bit more about non-professional issues like overall plans for a future career or holidays but not about ‘too private’ matters. I do not systematically look for friends at work. But friendly relationships, it is indeed nice and motivating to have. It sometimes makes it possible to solve complex professional relationships. Consequently, I often turn down invitations from colleagues. Third, I appreciate a real long lunch between 12:30 and 14:00. I have lunch home, especially when Matthieu is here and cooked. Then sometimes I try taking a small rest because I do not always manage to get asleep early on the evenings so that I feel tired in the afternoon. I really try to take a rewarding break. I do not think over and over the problems at work. Additionally, I am not comfortable having family pictures in my office. Nonetheless, it is funny but when I see someone with lots of responsibilities having a picture of his wife or his baby, I tell myself ‘he is not so wicked after all’. But I really do not see myself doing that in my office because this is my private life. I do not want everyone to know what my boyfriend or my parents look like or know that I am attached to my bothers or similar things...right! Furthermore, I do not take office work home nor perform personal activities at work. When the phone rings for personal reasons at work it has to be an emergency. Segmentation is also reflected in how I dress. I cannot wear at work what I wear at home because I have clothes with flashy colours, crested t-shirts, old jeans and large trousers. I do not see myself coming at work like that. A last manifestation of my daily segmentation is that when I arrive home, I take a shower which is really important when I come home. I change skin, if I may nicely say. This is made to alleviate my stress to spill over from work to home so that I can pursue my evening, especially call or send an sms to Matthieu or other friends.

Above all, I feel that I have hard time to be the same person both at work and outside work, but the gap tends gradually to be bridged as the situation is also changing. Indeed, there are two sides that are different even if they tend to get closer so long as I get more experience and feel more comfortable. But it is true that I am not the same as far as my personal life is concerned. In any case, at work I am a bit different. There I am in the context of responsibilities; this is why it is different. Nonetheless, I try to be more natural. It is true that I may have forced myself to wear blouses on a daily basis. This I do not do anymore nowadays. Today, I wear a pair of jeans- working jeans, I may say. More seriously, the work atmosphere changed because of the arrival of two new young and women employees so that I do not feel as isolated. With them, I learn to take breaks during day time and not be at my desk from 8:00 to 18:00. I also talk more about myself. Coming back from a meeting, I may just go to them and express either my satisfaction or disappointment. There is an evolution in the sense how easy it is for me to talk about my personal situation, about my professional difficulties to other people, of course not to strangers. For example, I even start to talk about my search for work. Indeed, my main challenge is today is to find a job in Paris because Matthieu, after a long unemployment period, just got a job there. In my search, I would accept a job with a lower hierarchical position. It is about finding a job that is interesting and enables me to blossom, that is to say that stresses me largely less and that does not creep into my life. It is about changing location and finding back Matthieu, my circle of friends in Maname and their consequences. Yes ! now that Matthieu has a job in Maname, the search for a new job in Maname is again a top priority for me.
Thibault

My name is Thibault. I am 33 years old. I portray my life through my work, few personal activities and some friendships, but above all through my relationships with Thara, my relationships with Thara's two kids, Tina and Tod, who I consider as my “almost family”. I live with Thara, my partner. We have been living and working, even in the same company in Lansa until my relocation in Jyve at another company site. After almost one year of weekly commuting between Lansa and Jyve, Thara but also one of her two kids will finally join me so that we can maybe be a family at last. When I think of work and non-work responsibilities, my well-being depends on my capacity to balance them which for me means to be present at 100% in what I am doing. It depends on having meaningful activities in work and non-work. Generally, I try to have a certain balance between both; that is to say when I am at the office, I am at work. If something goes wrong in my life I do not at least I try; but only the others could confirm this; not to make the others feel it. Unquestionably, I aim at separating my private and professional lives to avoid negative interferences. If, for example, work would take all of my time so that I cannot be with Thara, or if it was so disturbing that I could not get mentally out of it, this would be distressing. For the time being, I manage to mentally get out of work.

To mark the distinction, I do not like to talk about work at home or to talk about my personal life at work. Conversations about work are succinct, just when I come home. Then I concentrate on having quality time like small dinners, nice walk but also sharing household’s work and now taking care of the new house. Nonetheless, I admit that such segmenting is not easy and sometimes it feels also natural to talk about work at home. Undeniably, when I discuss with her, there are obviously times when we are talking about what she is doing at work, what I am doing at work, how things are going. But it is also true that I do not detail what I am exactly doing during the day. I have the advantage that she is in the same company so I can email documents. I like to ask her opinion. Actually, I benefit from her working in the same company. I do not have to explain the context. Finally she has another perspective of work which is complementary. Last month, after the management meeting, where I experienced a strange reaction from one of my colleagues, I discussed it with Thara over the weekend. Even if we did not fully agree on the outcome, this opened my eyes. Even so, when both working in Lansa, we neither did act as a couple nor were close to one another even during breaks. Above all, the fact not to make our relationship official is that I consider that my private life is my private life and so long as it does not influence my work, people have no right to know with whom I am living; I am not going to ask them with whom they sleep in the company. This segmentation is eased now that I work in Jyve even if there are some colleagues who know Thara. Integration is also eased because we are in the same company. It is easier to communicate during the week via emails, unless it disturbs work. Thara, for example, emails me the shopping list so that I have it on my mobile phone when I do the grocery shopping on Friday evenings. I also have laptop given by work, however, I often take it but do not open it at home. I prefer just to call and say that I may run late. After few months in my new work, my task is to help Thara and Tina to move her and adapt themselves to Jyve and its traffic jam. I will help Thara to find a new job as she was forced to resign. Being in the same company has not always advantages. Until then, one challenge for me to be daily in touch with Thara while she is looking for a job and awaiting answers from potential employers – not to allow such thoughts disturb me or disrupt my work. Then, we will need to develop a new sense in our relationships, on daily basis to go beyond my feeling of “almost-family”.
Hello, my name is Sarah. Reflecting on my life, the conclusion I draw from over 25 years of working experiences is that there is a great difficulty to separate what is relevant from the private and professional life in the sense that I feel that the professional life totally overwhelmns, I would say, the private life. This is a first assessment and it is getting more and more discernible. This has become quicker during the last few years that is to say that time-wise the professional life eats and crops into ones’ private life. In my personal view, people nowadays exist essentially through their professional identity. I personally, I am looking for authenticity and genuine exchange with other. First, this leads to proactively choose my non-work activities and relationships so that I am highlighting more than ever the importance of authenticity and exchange. Second during the recent years, I have become detached from my work, even if, of course, it definitely takes most of my time.

This detachment is noticeable in how I organize my work as my aim is to effectively use my time at the office to free myself out-of-office time. I have time slots at work for meetings and if I have anything forcing me to leave at 17:30 or 18:30, then I leave. I would even say that sometimes it is better to grasp a bite for lunch that will take only ten minutes rather than tolerate people I do not fully care about or spend time with people I for sure know they are going to bore me. So, indeed, I prefer to take a 10/15 minute lunch break and be able to leave at 17:30 for activities that I know will enrich my life even if this is not often well understood by those around me. Above all, most of the time, I try to be early at work, as I wake up around five o’clock every morning. This enables me to leave home early in the morning and work early to avoid rush hour in public transportation in Sagasse. But when working in open space, leaving the office a bit early is not seen as a good sign but since I have done my work and my tasks, I do not care. In that spirit, I regularly set time aside for some other activities, i.e. reservin a few mornings for yoga and meditation every week or a few evenings for the theatre and meeting with close friends. However such activities do not follow a regular schedule and thus I do not feel obliged to comply. I practice yoga since 20 years and for that I look for flexible options or à la carte options and this is not a vain use of the word “à la carte”. It is to be able to go when I want, when I can and without any new restrictions. I do not want to feel locked up by demanding schedules. The detachment from my work is also discernible in how I consider my relationships at work. There are purely professional relationships with the people I work with but share nothing more than work with them. There are people with whom I may share a bit more but I still meet them only at the office. There are few people from work, with whom I may even not have worked directly but with whom I really share similar interests and views. These people I meet them in private. The detachment from my work leads me to do my best to try to completely make sure to separate my professional life and my private life, like refusing to bring some work at home. For that, I refuse to have company laptops or mobile phones or any such gadgets. I do not give my office phone number to anyone even to my mother. Moreover, when I am on holiday I never give away any phone numbers, because I assume that I am not indispensible. For me, these are artefacts dictated by organisations that prevent the establishment of authentic relationships based on authentic people and not on organisational roles. Personally, I do not play any roles at work. I am myself. On the whole, I feel somehow that my attitude is against the overall context and the organisational culture, where being an individual is to some extent not well-perceived and hard to achieve. For example, I do not accept to be disturbed by colleagues when I am having lunch with an old colleague but this often happens. Similarly, there are some activities for personal development that are organised on the working site like Yoga. I have been asked to join, but I have not. I do not want to join. These activities are for me too personal and when I want to practice them, it is for and by myself.

Nonetheless, there are two exceptions to such segmentation. First, I take part in a project aiming at helping unemployed people to start over. This requires few hours in evaluating their business ideas. This is to be done during working time as it is in partnership with the company. Second, my company developed options to benefit from the “solidarity holidays” programme. The idea of the programme is to take a two-week holiday to accomplish a mission in a third world country so that part of travel costs will be raised by the firm. I hope to go to Africa. At least I am currently looking into the possibility for going and sharing my knowledge with working women. In both cases, you have the opportunity to really exchange your knowledge with others and find some sense of authenticity. To me, both experiences give me the opportunity to reinvigorate my life even if I do not actively seek such blending.

To conclude, I am in a continuous reflection about work, and the extent to which work is important in my life. This refection is supported by the fact that my non-work domain becomes central to my well-being. To me, feeling well is to live in accordance with myself and to lead as much as possible an authentic life. Feeling well is to have a conscious look over my life and try to live every second of it without being passive and constraint by it. In that regard, I wish, at some point of time, that people could better understand my situation and not think that as I am single with no child and financially independent, my life is easy and free of worries. Last but not least, feeling well is to find a balance in my whole life and try to keep each life domains at its legitimate place without having to neglect what is the essential on a daily basis. Today, it is clear that work is important but not as central as before. My choices when selecting my non-work activities support such view. Work is, for sure, not anymore my sole source of pleasure and my main challenge is to continuously get time for myself.
Paul

I am Paul. I have been working for JCLA since I started my career in 1986, I am now head of communication. I am single. More exactly, I am separated from the mother of my amazing nine year old daughter, Paola, and I have just started a new relationship with Patricia, an artist and mother of a small daughter. After reflection, I would portray my life as composed of eight different domains. Five domains are ideally the heart of my life and my well-being, i.e. family, Paola, sentimental relationship, personal time and friends. Beyond them, there are three domains, i.e. my work, my associative engagement and, even if a bit more far away, my acquaintances. In other terms the heart, when you look it, is the affective dimension, the psychological one, the others are more about relations and thus should be less essential. Nowadays, I nonetheless consider work as the main piece supporting my personal time and my relationships with Paola. I would thus say that as a principle I value both, a work and a non-work. Nevertheless, I feel that nowadays work is central. Indeed, I am always into the perspective that I could not be without it. I am afraid to lose it and do not know what could replace it.

Thinking of my life as a tree, work is like its trunk, that is to say it takes lots of space in my life and helps. I would say, to take advantages from the rest. Then without it; where am I, who am I? In other terms, there is a need to find the palliatives to get motivated again and again. I realise that being active in associations and having some social life to be two of the elements enabling the tree to stand when its trunk leans over.

This does not mean that I do not make distinctions. Indeed, every day I set limits between them. I try not to bring negative aspects of work home. I do not appreciate talking about work at home especially about problems however sharing positive experiences is more natural. For me, work-related troubles stop at the office’s doors. Generally, I do not like to talk about my work outside the work context because I do not define myself solely through my position. Then, I do not share purposely my private life at the office even with people I consider as friends, like Polydore. If I want to spend time with him, I would rather say “come for dinner home one evening”, I will be more available and we will talk about work no more than a few minutes. In addition, I do not bring work home. If I do, it has to be interesting material that I may read seated on the terrace, or it has to be important. On week days, I do not have lunch with my colleagues because we will talk about work. I enjoy going home to get one then read a bit on sofa, then go back to the office. In the evenings, I plan for leisure activities, alone or with friends like theatre or cinema most of the time. This helps me to have a contrast with the working day. On weekends, I definitely concentrate on personal activities like sport and exercising as I mentioned earlier. Generally, on Friday nights I shut all. I am in weekend and I would say the motivation for everything I will do will be my pleasure. Some weekends provide me with the time I need to do some personal things which I missed during the week due to lack of personal time. I would define “my personal time; this is the time I have for myself, when I take care of myself, basically the time I spend alone and devote to reading, going to cinema or having an entire weekend for myself.” Reading is definitely such a personal pleasure during the evenings when I come home or before sleeping. Even last Monday, I got up at 4:30, and buried myself in my current book before going to the office. In addition, I am keen to go out and select good novels at the FNAC megastore. I may sometimes go there during lunch break to relax. On weekends, this does not mean I do not think about work at all. My brain is still working. In fact tell myself that I shut. It makes one part of my brain completely free for something else and there is the other part that works openly. It for sure collects information but I do that so that it does not affect the quality of my weekend. I cut, but not completely.

My will to segment is thus moderated by some of my practices. First, I do not mind to meet acquaintances during my weekends and exchange a few words with them. Last Saturday or Sunday, I went to the theatre where I met some journalists, the person in charge of the communication of xxx, other personalities like that... etc. I was pleased to see them. We exchanged views, we talked a bit about work, we talked about other matters. And here we are; it is part or I would say they are part of my daily life. Second, during holidays I will not accept calls about work, from journalists, for example, when I am alone with Paola, but may ask to be called back if important. Doing so, it will not disturb our father-daughter time.

To sum it up, the most important factors linking work and non-work are pleasure and enrichment. When one domain creates pleasure or enriches the other, then I will actively blend both. Overall it is essential to concentrate on each domain. Personally, when I leave for work I am relaxed, yes, I am relaxed during the mornings, but on the contrary I do not like to lose time as I am here to work. I thus define time slots that follow each other. As a matter of fact, nowadays, when I am at work, I am at work- But as I might say “I need to work”, I might also say “now I want some time for myself” so that I will take time to see a friend during lunch time and come back later. Work and non-work is like if I had two children. Sometimes I am with one, other times I am with the other, but, I would say, I love to hug them both because I love them both a lot. I have developed such an attitude towards work/non-work experiences over time. Time taught me to draw a line between my work and non-work activities. And today, I have two challenges. First, I need to keep this balance between integration and segmentation and even reaffirm some boundaries. Second, I need to confront work that in some sense, as mentioned earlier, does not satisfy me anymore.
Brune

My name is Brune. I am 52 years old. I moved to Porpa in 1988, one year after my husband, Bernard. For that, I resigned from an interesting job. Nonetheless, only one month after my arrival I started my consultancy agency. I am now employed in a school as International Director. The desire in 1988 of not being jobless or a simple housewife illustrates how work is important to me. Work is complemented by my family life, my social life with few friends and my passion for American detective novels. My well-being is not dependent on how each of them ideally is, but on the fact that together they are functioning in a good harmony without having one life domain suffering more than another. I would say that my professional life is important to me and it obviously has always taken a central and evident role in my life. I know that since my parents divorced. My mother was devastated because her life was only composed of her family life. I told myself that I would never like to be in a similar situation.

Viewing work and non-work as integrated, I am not hesitant to talk about work at home even share some troubling situation as well as positive experiences. It is normal among the family members to talk about your day and what you have done even if not always in detail. I am easily bringing work home using my laptop. Generally speaking as I will think of a personal matter when I am at the office, I will think of work when I am home. There is no clear separation. I cannot say: “When I close the door of my office, it is finished, I will not think of it, talk about it at home”, for sure we will talk about it! Bernard is also concerned about my work. He interacts with my network of foreign contacts as they come visit. He regularly gives French courses for exchange students, an activity which made available to him. This is one concrete way to which my professional life and couple life interact. Additionally, by bringing lots of foreign contacts home. I think that I contribute to the development of my children as I believe that the demands and my responsibility towards them evolve. I let these contacts interact freely with my life outside the office. Another sign showing that I see my work and non-work as one is that I am the same type of individual at work and in private. In both arenas I strive to create an environment characterised with respect and friendship. I am as affective in both domains. I have also a similar way of dealing with problems by listening, trying to be consensual and if necessary imposing my choice. I am finally in need to be a real team player at home and at work.

Besides this integrated view, I still recognize that I set some boundaries between work and non-work. First, having worked somehow from 7:00 to 20:00, I try not to check my e-mails in the evenings. During weekends, I may nonetheless check them as well as work on the laptop to finalise some issues. Second, I set some boundaries around my couple life by reserving time to spend with my husband like chatting in the evenings and or planning some renovations in the house. Fourth, as I am in charge of my own schedule, there are some periods in the year where I would not travel and will do all I can to be here. It concerns time when important familial events may take place. In June, my daughter will pass the first part of the baccalauréat; I will thus make sure that I am available for her. Finally, one element that I really do not mix and do not want to mix is money. As the law does not allow me to be entitled to a business credit card, I opened a second account at my bank not to be a burden on the family budget. It is easier to handle the issue and in that way the accounting department does not see what I bought at the supermarket last Saturday.

So yes! I segment, but just for a few elements. Once more I do not consider that I segment my work and my non-work. As a matter of fact, sometimes, I tell myself that if I was dressing boundaries and putting more distance between my work, my personal networks and my family life, etc., times would be better and things easier when I would be stressed and having lots to do. Indeed, some of my colleagues say: “Personally as soon as I leave school, it is finished, I do not think about work and there is no interference”. I believe that in stressful situation, they are lucky, but in other situations I think that they are not benefiting of having exchanges with people they meet professionally.” What I know is that interaction is essential to me.

And today this interaction is somehow endangered. Work is omnipresent and I feel that I miss time to be able to reflect and respect my engagements. Maybe for the first time I feel that the interactions between my professional and family lives do not bring me the usual energy. I feel the pain of not having, for maybe many years, being as involved as I should have in my personal life. Nonetheless, it is indeed central to my well-being that these interactions are harmonious as far as the equilibrium itself is never reached and is always fragile and can always be jeopardised. To create such harmony, I need to make sure that people around me are fine. I need to make sure that I am present physically but also mentally. Currently, I feel that I work 80% and I am away more than three months a year. So make sure that, wherever I could be, my loved ones can be in touch with me. As mentioned before, demands are different. Support is not any longer solely about being physically and materially present. Last weekend Bastian called just to ask what wine he should bring to a dinner he was invited to. I was just glad to be of help. This is as simple as that. To create harmony, I also need to feel the energy for driving projects and I need my actions to be in line with their objectives and my essential values. These values are about having exchange with others, about sharing with others but also and foremost about respecting others as well as myself. These values enabled and will continue to enable me to make choices when prioritising work or non-work.
Geremy

My name is Geremy. I am 37 years old, married with Gelina with whom I have three boys. Since a few months ago, we move to Macbala where I started a new job as General Director of Marketing and Export in an industrial food company. Previously, I was in Padrian working in a cosmetic and pharmaceutical SME as Commercial Director for the French market. Generally speaking, I would simply portray my life as composed of four main life domains; my family, my work, my personal time and my social life. To me, these life domains are close one to the other. It would nonetheless be wrong to come to the conclusion that I am proactively making them interact. I will say that their interactions are the results of hazard. There is no intention from my side to make them different. I do not seek creating boundaries or borders. I manage my time in the function of my family, but otherwise there are not clear defined borders that would exclude my family from my work issues or from my side activities and vice-versa. More precisely, I actually do not ask myself loads of questions. I take things as they come. I do not have conflicts. Conflicts are for me with people you do not like so that finally there is no interest to meet these people, as simple as that. Then when you look at the origin of conflicts you may have with people you like, it is often about nothing. By learning, I do generally manage to handle and lessen conflict. Having this in mind, my work/non-work experiences are thus natural and not an intentional mix of segmentation and integration. The equilibrium is about having my four life domains interacting in harmony.

But I realize that there is a gap between what I experienced in Padrian and what I experience today. In Padrian, there was family first and I organized my work and my personal life around it. Then present in the middle of this life were friends whom we indeed met a lot and went out a lot. On a daily basis, I aimed at being at work around 8:30/9:00 after some morning having left the kids at schools. In the evenings I tried not to leave work after 18:30 that was in line with the organisational culture. This time schedule was also reinforced by the presence of a security guard who was checking the offices around 19:30, the maximum limit one could stay behind in the office. This was different from the culture in the larger group I worked before, where meetings started at 19:00! I appreciated this rhythm as I could go and golf in the evenings. On Tuesdays and Fridays I could also go and play football with the local senior team of the village. I would indeed insist that things were interacting well that is to say that there was a real harmony. Life was harmonious. The family was fine. Work and daily life were simple. I managed to have extra time for some associative work and things I like. In addition, around that, we had a network of close and less close friends. It was comfortable. At the present time, family and work are at the same level and I cannot really distinguish between them. I do not know what my priority is when allocating my time. I feel at the maximum for both of them. Both sides of my life are close to each other. Then after that there are friends. Friends are still here but we just see them less on a daily basis. Finally, I have the feeling that I do not have any personal time right now. In practice, I have a full agenda every day. I work twice more than what I did before. I have to leave earlier, often around 6:00, for work. Now I have a 40-minute drive and need to prepare a bit before meetings. I have longer business travels even abroad. Of course, I still try to limit myself to two three days, i.e. two nights, of business trips over the week but it is still more. Kids sometimes tease me when I am home for dinner by saying, “Ooh today we eat with daddy!” This may be a sign. I am also working more on evenings. Evidently, I was already bringing some work home when we lived in Padrian. This has not changed and I still work when kids are asleep. For that, I just open the laptop anywhere in the house and put earplugs to isolate myself a little bit. But if I do that more often even when the kids are asleep, it influences the amount of time I can dedicate to Galina. In addition, I am also working more on weekends rather than before this was only for family. Overall, I may start to realise that it is harder for me to make some distinctions between work and family, whereas it was so natural before.

I think that everything will go back to normal, once I will have successfully managed the situation at work so that it takes me less time. I guess that this will happen when I have my first results in few months. Beyond that my personal deadline is the end of 2008. Yes, I give myself two years, until then, as I said, I do not ask myself lots of questions.
5. SEGMENTING AND/OR INTEGRATING AS WORK/NON-WORK PREFERENCES

Kossek et al. (2005; 2006) indicate that one individual has a preference even implicit. In this study, by narrating their work/non-work experiences individuals indeed reveal work/non-work preferences as integrating or segmenting preferences in a more or less explicit manner. Three main elements are indeed noticeable. First, individuals have an overall preferences, second their have more specific preferences and last they are more or less explicit of these diverse preferences.

**Overall preferences**

Such preferences are first expressed as an overall preference. Marine, Sarah and Thibault express an overall preference in segmenting work and non-work. Marine and Sarah indicate that their individual preference is in contrast with the experienced societal expectation of “blending” so that they fight to enact it. Thibault searches for segmenting to avoid negative interference between both domains. Contrasting Sarah to Marine and Thibault, we can see that Sarah and Marine define work and non-work domains whereas Thibault has a variety of domains from the start. Compare to Sarah, segmentation for Thibault and Marine is strong but not extreme. It is explicit but not extremely explicit. Sarah’s segmenting preference is strong and explicit especially when it comes to time and relationships. Brune is the only one who explicitly seeks a high degree of integration as she clearly considers both as complementary and interdependent. Paul and Geremy stand out in their preferences. Geremy has implicit preferences. He considers the interaction between his domains as “natural”. He however primordially sees their interactions as central so that he rather values integrating his domains. Paul has to some extent explicitly a more balanced preference. Such balanced preference is not as explicit whereas he touches upon some desire of segmentation. As a matter of fact he sees work and non-work as one but he daily and intentionally separates them without excluding the possibilities to integrate them when ‘pleasure’ and ‘enrichment’ are at stake. Segmentation is more explicit for Paul but largely implicitly moderated by diverse opportunities of integration. As a whole, in line with the theory and the common view in the work/life field, preferences could be placed on the integration-segmentation continuum where a certain variety emerges among individuals. Without any intention to “measure” and “compare” between each individual, Figure 3 represents an un-scaled representation of the once work/non-work preferences between integration and segmentation, in relation to their level of explicitness.

![Figure 3 - The work/non-work preferences for the six middle-managers](image)
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M=Marine; T=Thibault; S=Sara; P=Paul; B=Brune; G=Geremy

After having placed each individual, this model lets 5 patterns emerging. (1) A preference for pushed integration, (2) A preference for integration moderated by segmentation, (3) A balanced preference between segmentation and integration, (4) A preference for segmentation moderated by integration and (5) A preference for pushed segmentation. These five patterns are to some extent in line with the social mindscapes as presented by Zerubavel (1997): rigid mind (segmentation) (1;2), fuzzy mind (integration) (4;5) and flexible mind (3). What is striking is that none of these preferences value strong integration or
strong segmentation, that is to say one or the other extreme of the integration-segmentation continuum. In the lens of Zerubavel (1991), this may reinforce that both the rigid and fuzzy minds should not be extreme because they can lead to a loss of identity either through overindividuation or underindividuation. Such loss of identity is indeed an essential dynamic when considering the origins of the work/non-work preferences, where the sense of oneself is central. It is even explicitly expressed by Marine and Sarah. As a whole, these five patterns spread on the continuum as in figure 4.

![Figure 4 - Work/non-work preferences and the work/non-work continuum](image)

This shows some degree of diversity in individual's preferences. It supports previous research considering that the continuum could be seen as a mirror of the work/non-work preferences (Ashforth, et al., 2000; Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005). However, the revealing of an “overall” work/non-work preferences as above is vague and does not enable a full comprehension of the content of such preferences. One must thus pay closer attention to the self-narratives and focus our attention on each types of boundaries.

**Specific preferences**

Marine expresses some preference for segmentation in regards to emotional boundaries by indicating that she “would try” to alleviate the weight of her professional life in her family life mainly in relation to her life with Matthieu. This is also applicable to her wish not to share negative thoughts with him. She expresses the same when it comes to talking about her work situation showing how it does not creep into her weekends. Here one can identify that the segmentation is not as extreme but desired. This non-extreme segmentation is also revealed in her wish to be living in Paris so that she could share part of her work troubles with friends by saying, “let’s meet in a few minutes because now I am not fine at all”. This view of her preference is to be completed by her mentioning that personally she draws boundaries between work and non-work on a daily basis. Such daily segmentation is revealed by a temporal and spatial work/non-work preference for segmentation when discussing lunch break: “I go and have lunch home (...) I really try to take a rewarding break, where I do not think of problems at work”. Marine has a preference for segmentation in terms of her work/non-work human boundaries: “I do a priori not want to mix and say: ‘we will all be friends’: this is really, really different.” She indicates as well that she does not want everyone to know what her boyfriend or her parents look like or she does not want them to know that she is attached to her brother or similar things. Finally, she also mentions that behaviourally she is having hard time to be the same person both at work and outside work. Segmentation is thus not wished at its extreme in terms of behaviours but it can be explained within a more balanced view. Interpreting Marine’s self-narrative, I conclude that she explicitly values segmentation especially for her human, and negative cognitive boundaries which she thinks to find in Paris: “In Paris there is the issue of physical distance, you rarely mix with colleagues; well thinking of the colleagues I have had in Paris, I notice that once you have left the office you do not see them again. There is huge geographical distance. In a way, everyone goes home and thus there is no real connection.” She also explicitly expresses a segmentation preference for emotion but a bit more implicitly indicates a wish to be able to share them with her close friends. She values daily segmentation of time and space which supports her
segmentation preferences above. Finally, her behavioural preference is more implicit and towards integration. Figure 5 represents these preferences indicating whether these preferences are explicit or implicit. It also shows their combination into Marine’s overall work/non-work preference.

Figure 5 - Marine’s work/non-work preferences

Thibault explicitly conveys a preference for segmentation when it comes to his work/non-work cognitive as well as emotional boundaries. Indeed, he “tries” when at the office to be at work. Additionally he also tries “at least not to make the others feel” that he may have a problem or trouble related to the other domains. This is to be associated with a desire to separate his time and space. However, spatial and temporal separation is less explicit in his self-narrative. It seems to be natural for him to segment these aspects. He indicates spatial and temporal segmentation in a larger context: “If, for example, work would take all of my time so that I cannot be with Thara or if it was so disturbing that I could not get mentally out of it, this would be distressing.” Or his saying, “It is also easy to bring the laptop home. This may give the opportunity to work a while. However, I often take it but do not open it. I also prefer just to call and say that I may be late rather than taking work home”. It is easy to observe here that the desired spatial separation is not strong. One could even say that being in Jyve and Thara in Lansa would be ideal if Thibault wished such extreme segmentation. But this is obviously not the case as one dynamic condition for Thibault is to make Thara come to Jyve. Segmentation is also a balanced preference in regards to Thibault’s work/non-work human boundaries. He considers that it is possible to mix work and non-work relationships, if they do not influence work. This is central for him to justify that dating Thara is not a problem. In other words, all is fine as far as his private life stays private. However, he vaguely mentions that this is not applicable when hierarchical relationships are concerned. In such a context, segmentation is explicitly desired. Finally, Thibault presents himself as someone working with deadlines in both work and non-work and as someone practicing golf both in work and non-work contexts. This indicates that he implicitly feels to be and acts the same way in both domains. Listening to Thibault, it is understandable that he values segmentation especially for his emotional and cognitive (negative) boundaries that are central for his well-being and quite explicit. Part of such segmentation is explicit when it comes to work/family preferences and relationships involving hierarchical contacts. Part of his integration is implicit when it comes to work/social life and work/private life relationships as well as work/family relations. Besides, Thibault values daily temporal and spatial work/non-work segmentation that is a natural and implicit way to reach what he calls his balance. Spatial preference is however not as strong because he sees the possibility to work at home. When it comes to behavioural boundaries, integration is implicit. Figure 6 represents these preferences.
indicating whether these preferences are explicit or implicit. It also indicates their combination into Thibault’s overall work/non-work preference.

Sarah expresses a clear desire for temporal segmentation between a work and non-work where work is compulsory and non-work made to enrich herself: “my aim is to effectively use my time at the office to free my out-of-office time”. She reveals an explicit propensity to structure her days: “So, indeed, I prefer to take a 10/15 minute lunch break and be able to leave at 17:30 for activities that I know will enrich my life.” She also expresses a strong segmentation in terms of human relationships. She definitely does not consider people at work more than part of her professional relationships. If she does so, there is a need for affection or strong connections. This can be via her passion, however, it is exceptional and does not systematically lead to friendship like in the case of Samia. Sarah is thus restrictive on friendships and nowadays does not look to develop new friendships. Nonetheless, she leaves the possibility for them to occur. This renders her segmentation strong but not extreme. Besides, Sarah has a strong segmentation preference of her space: “like refusing to bring some work at home”. She insists on having never worked at home during her 25-year career. She does not want to join activities like yoga on the workplace. Furthermore, she desires her strain not to spillover, indicating thus psychosomatic boundaries favouring segmentation. This is connected with some segmentation in terms of behaviours like when she says: “It is nonetheless important to note that even if I have a scientific background, I do not always enjoy visiting scientific exhibitions or museums”. Additionally she describes the omnipresence of work talks and thoughts at dinners with friends. She also describes the tendency in society and the company to talk over problems and not solve them (ruminate to some extent). She compares the situation to what she wishes, i.e. a segmentation of thoughts whereas it is not as explicit. Finally, only when it comes to emotional boundaries, one can perceive the wish to be the same in both domains. This is manifest in her statement: “personally, I do not play any roles at work. I am myself”. She as well talks about artefacts put in place by companies to make people different at work. She constantly says that authenticity is lost. This indeed indicates that emotionally she would like work and non-work to be more in harmony or integrated. Listening to Sarah’s self-narratives, it is reasonable to conclude that she highly values segmentation. Such segmentation is related to one key word in her self-narrative: detachment. This segmentation is certainly central and explicit in terms of spatial, temporal, human and psychosomatic boundaries. Whereas the level of segmentation in terms of behavioural boundaries and cognitive boundaries is as strong, their explicitness is less. They are more anchored in her current reflections and thus not as explicit. When it comes to her preference for more integrative view on emotional boundaries, this is indeed central as the search for authenticity is a strong dynamic for Sarah. What is important to understand is that her perceived lack of authenticity in society reinforces her current desire to segment
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Sarah expresses a clear desire for temporal segmentation between a work and non-work where work is compulsory and non-work made to enrich herself: “my aim is to effectively use my time at the office to free my out-of-office time”. She reveals an explicit propensity to structure her days: “So, indeed, I prefer to take a 10/15 minute lunch break and be able to leave at 17:30 for activities that I know will enrich my life.” She also expresses a strong segmentation in terms of human relationships. She definitely does not consider people at work more than part of her professional relationships. If she does so, there is a need for affection or strong connections. This can be via her passion, however, it is exceptional and does not systematically lead to friendship like in the case of Samia. Sarah is thus restrictive on friendships and nowadays does not look to develop new friendships. Nonetheless, she leaves the possibility for them to occur. This renders her segmentation strong but not extreme. Besides, Sarah has a strong segmentation preference of her space: “like refusing to bring some work at home”. She insists on having never worked at home during her 25-year career. She does not want to join activities like yoga on the workplace. Furthermore, she desires her strain not to spillover, indicating thus psychosomatic boundaries favouring segmentation. This is connected with some segmentation in terms of behaviours like when she says: “It is Nonetheless important to note that even if I have a scientific background, I do not always enjoy visiting scientific exhibitions or museums”. Additionally she describes the omnipresence of work talks and thoughts at dinners with friends. She also describes the tendency in society and the company to talk over problems and not solve them (ruminate to some extent). She compares the situation to what she wishes, i.e. a segmentation of thoughts whereas it is not as explicit. Finally, only when it comes to emotional boundaries, one can perceive the wish to be the same in both domains. This is manifest in her statement: “personally, I do not play any roles at work. I am myself”. She as well talks about artefacts put in place by companies to make people different at work. She constantly says that authenticity is lost. This indeed indicates that emotionally she would like work and non-work to be more in harmony or integrated. Listening to Sarah’s self-narratives, it is reasonable to conclude that she highly values segmentation. Such segmentation is related to one key word in her self-narrative: detachment. This segmentation is certainly central and explicit in terms of spatial, temporal, human and psychosomatic boundaries. Whereas the level of segmentation in terms of behavioural boundaries and cognitive boundaries is as strong, their explicitness is less. They are more anchored in her current reflections and thus not as explicit. When it comes to her preference for more integrative view on emotional boundaries, this is indeed central as the search for authenticity is a strong dynamic for Sarah. What is important to understand is that her perceived lack of authenticity in society reinforces her current desire to segment
work and non-work. The preference of integration does not moderate her segmentation preference but reinforces it. It is also perceivable in her overall description of her life as composed of two major life domains, i.e. work and non-work, where the distinction is solely based on her authenticity quest. Figure 7 represents these preferences indicating whether they are explicit or implicit. It also indicates their combination into Sarah’s overall work/non-work preference.

Paul expresses a preference for the segmentation of his temporal boundaries. This is expressed in his scheduling and wish to have meaningful time outside in the evenings. It is also clear from the way he sees the time he spends on weekends and his saying that “generally, on Friday nights I shut all. I am in weekend and I would say the motivation for everything I will do will be my pleasure”. Time is for Paul essential and thus optimising is a strong dynamic in his work/non-work experiences which reinforces preference for segmentation: “I want to be effective utilizing the transportation time which is no constraint but simply a compulsory time to take into account. I arrange weekends with four or five slots following each other. I would not say it is not stressing”. Even when doing non-work activities in the office, he mentions that time-wise it is different so that he mentally differs. It is also striking in his distinction of lunch time: “It is a bit like a truck driver, I would say. On the one hand, the driver would fill in his truck or eat on his working time. On the other hand, enjoying fresh air or having a coffee, this is agreeable and not he working time. This is the same for me”. As regards his spatial preference it is observable that he does not express a strong preference for using particular spaces for particular activities but would rather somehow naturally have a mixture of spaces that can be used interchangeably. He may consider taking work at home when necessary, reading it on his terrace. He listens to the radio for pleasure and work in the mornings at home. He checks private emails and performs associative activities at work. In addition, Paul is someone who is emotional in work and non-work domains, seeking no emotional segmentation. As he indicates, he is happy to go to work and show such happiness there as he shows it at home. He also tends maybe not to be afraid to show some frustration at work but he is largely implicit about it while he discusses at some point his irritation with work. When it comes to cognitive boundaries, segmentation and integration are mixed preferences. For him problems should stay at the office and end at the door but has no problem sharing positive experiences. He also indicates that he gets ideas from whatever domains because there is always one part of his brain (work or non-work) that “is still working” and is on watch, when the other shuts. A similar mix is revealed for Paul’s work/non-work human boundaries. On the one hand, he does not like to use his professional and private networks of people when helping Pollyanna in her search of work. On the other hand, he appreciates meeting his
work acquaintances outside and will mix work and non-work networks if it strengthens his relationships: “Last Saturday or Sunday, I went to the theatre where I met some journalists, the person in charge of the communication of xxx, other personalities like that... etc. I was pleased to see them. We exchanged views, we talked a bit about work, we talked about other matters. And here we are; it is part or I would say they are part of my daily life”. He also develops friendships at work and does not consider it an issue if well managed in time and space. Finally, Paul has also similar work/social behaviours as he uses his skills as project manager and as communication manager in his associative engagements. His way to organise time is similar regarding work and non-work: “I plan holidays, weekends and business trips in the same way”. Listening to Paul, what is striking in his preference is that it is difficult to see whether he integrates work and non-work and moderates such integration with punctual segmentation or vice versa. On the one hand, one may see a daily preference of segmentation and a longer term preference of integration. Hence, he seems to value both work and non-work and wants to see them harmonized. Such harmony goes hand in hand with integrating elements that provide him enrichment. Such integration may be a long term view where one driver is to “take time to live better and bring the best from the social relations that are relevant to my work”. This integration is discussed as a harmony between his work and his life and moderated by a preference for segmentation especially in daily life. On the other hand, one might however see the contrary, where segmentation is Paul’s main preference and integration a punctual situated preference. He considers having borders between his working period and holidays but will not mind to get calls if they are planned not to disturb the time he spends with his daughter. He has friends at work, but behaves differently towards them, depending on the situation of the meeting. In addition, when at the borders between work and non-work, this dilemma is expressed by Paul himself and his answer is not as clear as one can think: “So, I would say it is at the border between work and non-work. No it is actually not. It is how work and non-work overlap and this is not at all a problem. On the contrary, I would say working and having fun or having fun and simultaneously meeting professional contacts, this is what one wants. To me, I think it is more working and having fun.” As a whole, discussing Paul’ preference, it is fundamental to take into account the level of explicitness in his self-narrative. Doing so, it becomes clear that temporal segmentation is central and explicit. Human segmentation is not so strong, though it is reinforced by the fact that his work acquaintances will remain work acquaintances even if he meets outside work. Indeed, what is essential is the strengthening of work relationships and not the development of friendship. Spatial and emotional preferences are not as explicit and both bear traces of segmentation and integration. When it comes to cognitive behaviours, he explicitly wishes to segment negative thoughts but less explicitly accepts positive thoughts to be integrated. Finally, his former experiences of strain due to work stress make psychosomatic boundaries to be also present. However, his negative work/non-work experience is more than 25 years old. Therefore such preference is today not fully communicated even if he is personally fully aware of it. Figure 8 represents these preferences indicating whether they are explicit or implicit. It also indicates their combination into Paul’s overall work/non-work preference.
Brune shows strong integration in terms of human relationships. She sees her professional contacts as friends and lets them interact freely with her life outside the office, and her family. Such integration is essential for her sense of enrichment that work brings: “by bringing lots of foreign contacts at home, I think that I contribute to the development of my children as I believe that the demands and my responsibility towards them evolve”. She indicates a strong emotional integration due to her being as emotional in her diverse life domains. This is similar for her thoughts and thus her negative and positive cognitive boundaries: “As I will think of a personal matter when I am at the office, I will think of work when I am home”. She insists that there is no clear separation that could lead her to say: “When I close the door of my office, it is finished, I will not think of it, talk about it at home”. Furthermore, Brune expresses that she has similar behaviours at work and outside work: “I see my work and non-work as one is that I am the same type of individual at work and in private (...) I have also a similar way of dealing with problems by listening, trying to be consensual and if necessary imposing my choice.” She however “theoretically” recognises that segmentation may be valued when facing a stressful situation, however, for her this will limit the possibility of enrichment which reinforces her sense of integration: “I believe that in stressful situation, they are lucky, but in other situations I think that they are not benefiting of having exchanges with people they meet professionally. Finally, they may be recovering and sleeping better when they are stressed”. This indicates that she may have a small preference for segmenting strain. Nevertheless, she mentions that energy needs to be integrated. Nowadays, she feels some lack of energy affecting her entire life. This reveals psychosomatic boundaries for strain as towards segmentation and for energy towards integration. Finally, she discusses some separation of her time and space on a daily basis as diverse natural periods of time and place, when and where, non-work or work take place. Listening to Brune’s self-narratives, it is understandable that she highly values integration: “Work is not separated from my life, it belongs to my life.” This is really explicit for her human, and emotional boundaries that are central for her overall preference. When it comes to her cognitive boundaries, we could however see a difference between positive and negative thoughts where she values the fact that she can integrate them and have her thoughts shared mainly with her husband. She however wishes to be mentally present for her children and thus limiting such segmentation. For positive thoughts, her integration preference is less explicit, rather natural in her way to see family or her spouse’s role. It is also due to the fact the she works in an area close to her and her husband’s heart: internationalisation. When it comes to her behaviours, she adopts mainly similar behaviours, but this is not as explicit. Finally, what is interesting is that in terms of time and space, Brune daily values segmentation of both aspects. This is a natural way to see and handle her work/non-work experiences. Some part of this segmentation is indeed explicit but most of it is natural, making the level of explicitness definitely lower in regards to both boundaries. Segmentation is also somehow valued for strain whereas energy needs to be integrated. Theses’ psychosomatic boundaries are however not as explicit. This indicates that integration is probably not to be extreme for Brune. Figure 9 represents these preferences indicating
whether they are explicit or implicit. It also indicates their combination into Brune’s overall work/non-work preference.

**Geremy** is not so explicit on his preferences for his diverse boundaries. He mentions that for him his domains interact naturally and with no intentional integration or segmentation: “There is no intention from my side to make them different. I do not seek creating boundaries or borders. I manage my time in the function of my family, but otherwise there are not clear defined borders that would exclude my family from my work issues or from my side activities and vice-versa”. It is thus essential to look at how he acts between work and non-work, i.e. between his diverse life domains. Looking closer at his use of time and space, one can see that he does not look for any distinction. He works wherever and whenever and can make a non-work place becoming a working place. For example, he makes the café close to the beach becoming a workplace. He works on the kitchen table and anywhere else at home. He, however, does not mention using his workplace for other life domain purposes (some segmentation). He develops certain behaviours to motivate and take decisions that are natural for him to use in both contexts of work and other non-work domains like family (with kids) or social life (associative engagement). He naturally mixes people from different domains as it enriches his various life domains. For example, alumni friends seen as family members. Crossing people from diverse domains enables ideas to be generated. He recognizes that he needs to engage himself to help entrepreneurs to learn about how to run their own businesses because he one day would like to have his own company. Work ideas may also come from his talks and discussions with Galina who reads his marketing plans. Here again he underlines the normality of such integration of the cognitive boundaries on the basis that they have the same education and the same background in marketing. Listening to Geremy, it is realistic to conclude that he values integration. This is perceivable for his human, cognitive, spatial and behavioural boundaries. It is also visible when it comes to energy (psychosomatic boundaries). However some of his current reflection reveals that such integration is not as extreme as we can think. He is currently puzzled that he cannot make the distinction between these different domains especially work and family and that is not how things should be: “Overall, I may start to realise that it is harder for me to make some distinctions between work and family, whereas it was so natural before. This is especially the case during weekends”. This indicates that ‘normally’ some segmentation is taking place. Such segmentation could be seen in terms of time where he explains that before he had some limits especially on week-ends. It can also be seen in terms of thoughts and strain from work. Indeed in the present situation he shows to be overloaded by work which leads to some strain and associated fatigue. Some segmentation can also be perceived while he describes

![Figure 9 - Brune's work/non-work preferences](image)
his work/non-work experience in Padrian as harmonic and simple where all domains have their own place: “things were interacting well that is to say that there was a real harmony. Life was harmonious. The family was fine. Work and daily life were simple. I managed to have extra time for some associative work and things I like. In addition, around that, we had a network of close and less close friends. It was comfortable”. In such view, one can thus see that a certain preference for segmentation in regards to temporal boundaries moderates his integrative view. Figure 10 represents these preferences indicating whether they are explicit or implicit. It also indicates their combination into Geremy’s overall work/non-work preference.

All in all, Marine, has mostly explicit and segmenting preferences. Sarah indicates contrary to her preference that integration can be positive when it brings her authenticity like for the future journey in Africa. Thibault who was explicitly looking for a high degree of segmentation but his preference is undermined with some desired integration of the social and work domain by having friends among colleagues and some desire of being the same at work and outside work. This view is reinforced when he indicates that his well-being depends on his capacity to balance his life domains which for him means to be present at 100% in one domain. Here such balance is to be seen as a pushed segmentation where margins for integration are recognized. Such nuances are central for Thibault to understand. He says: “I believe the balance between the life domains comes from the understanding and management of the interfaces between the domains. And I think that I am aware of them.” Segmentation for Thibault is rather strong but not extreme and explicit but not extremely explicit. Brune is the only one who explicitly seeks a high degree of integration for her diverse boundaries. However, she daily favours segmentation especially of temporal boundaries, which in turn alter her overall preference. So Brune values integration but not as an extreme preference. Such a preference is also rather explicit for her. Beyond such a preference what seems central for Brune is that her “well being is not dependent on how each of the domains ideally is, but on the fact that together they are functioning in a good harmony without having one life domain suffering more than another”. Paul’s preference is more towards a segmentation, but such segmentation is largely balanced by a more implicit desire for integration and a strong balance between segmentation and integration for his human boundaries. It leads to view Paul’s preference as balanced and moderately explicit in that regards. Such balance is nonetheless perceivable to some extent, particularly when he says: “Work and non-work is like if I had two children. Sometimes I am with one, other times I am with the other, but, I would say, I love to hug them both because I love them both a lot”. Geremy whose preference was more focused on integration recognises to be aware of a certain level of segmentation that needs to be present to enable harmony. Geremy’s work/non-work preference is thus
more of a moderate or not pushed integration where a small level of segmentation occurs, especially in terms of time. Time being important, it influences his overall preference. Geremy’s work/non-work preference is however certainly not so explicit but he is aware of it as he acts naturally between work and non-work. Geremy is indeed aware of what is the most important thing for him to attain harmony between his domains and care of what matters most that is to say his family. Listening further to each middle-manager, it is thus observable that they all of them express specific preferences for specific aspects of their boundary work and boundary management. These specific preferences are not systematically in line with their overall preference. This renders preferences between segmenting and/or integrating to be neither pure nor extreme.

Level of preferences

Listening carefully to these specific preferences enables to further understand the 5 patterns above especially in regards to the explicitness of these preferences in each individuals’ contexts. The level of explicitness for specific preferences varies across the different types of boundaries for the same individual. This indicates substantial differences in how one is aware about his/her specific preferences. Some of one’s specific preference may then play a greater role in the determination of the overall preference. Listening to each middle-manager, it becomes obvious that the most influential boundaries seem to be the human boundaries. This reinforces the importance of considering human boundaries in a systematic way while discussing individual’s work/non-work experiences. This may also be because the society of today tends to make such boundary permeable (Pettinger, 2005). The emotional, cognitive negative and temporal boundaries are substantially influencing one’s overall preference. This indicates that time and thoughts are a central element in one’s work/non-work preferences. Time may be central because it is controllable and because the value of time is central to our modern society (Boisard, Cartron, Gollac, & Valeyre, 2003; Dugan, 2007; European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2006; Perlow, 1998). Negative thoughts may be central because individuals aim at controlling them to avoid spillover. Trying to disconnect mentally and avoid negative thoughts is often put forward as a coping strategy (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005; Sonnentag & Kruehl, 2006; Zijlstra & Sonnentag, 2006). Individuals’ overall work/non-work preferences are however less influenced by spatial and behavioural boundaries that nonetheless are more influential than cognitive positive and psychosomatic boundaries. These aspects may be less concrete for individuals.

As a whole, when considering the preference, individuals have some explicitness about their work/non-work preference but at diverse levels. The level of explicitness of specific and/or overall work/non-work preference depends on two characteristics: self-awareness and outspokenness. Awareness refers to the extent individuals are 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 oneself and others. When implicit, individuals are still acting between work and non-work. Nonetheless, they do not really know how to explain such approach and do not pay attention and do effort to verbalise it for themselves or others. It is seen as natural to deal with work and non-work interactions. When explicit, the level of explicitness depends on the extent to which individuals are aware of their preferences and on the extent individuals communicate them verbally to themselves and others. Four major levels of explicitness could be been observed as in figure 11.

---

4 This relates to the development of domain that is also based on specific boundaries and not systematically on every single boundary
To conclude on segmenting and/or integrating as work/non-work preferences, I conclude that all of them have an overall preference as an approach to manage their work/non-work boundaries but at the end, preferences for segmenting or integrating are not extreme but tempered via specific preferences for specific aspect of one's life. These preferences may be more or less explicit. This empirically supports the assertion of Kossek et al. (2005) that everyone has a work/non-work preference and clearly indicate that SEGMENTING AND INTEGRATING ARE COMPLEMENTARY PREFERENCES. Based on these findings five patterns merges more clearly as in figure 12.

6. SEGMENTING AND/OR INTEGRATING AS WORK/NON-WORK ACTIVITIES

In line with the proactive view of the work/non-work process (see figure 2), preferences are “reinforced” by what people do between work and non-work. They are reflected in individuals’ work/non-work activities. The analysis of such activities (see Languilaire, 2009 for a complete list of the work/non-work activities) anchors the notion that specific boundaries are created and maintained according to specific...
preferences as well as the notion that some activities are intentionally developed to express. Above all, the systematic analysis of work/non-work activities reveals that activities for segmenting and segmenting represent diverse motives. Namely, the narrated activities have either daily or long-term implications. The sections below review both types of activities.

**Daily work/non-work activities**

The most striking daily activities concern the segmentation of space, time, people and thoughts. They concern both placement and transcendence activities. For most of these segmenting activities, a certain level of intention is discernable so that individual shows willingness in segmenting on daily basis. Marine and Sarah would not perform activities related to a domain when being in another spatially defined domain such as yoga on the work site (space; placement). Paul, Sarah and Marine would not take documents related to one domain when going to another domain (space, transcendence). Marine and Paul would intentionally have lunch at home (Space, placement). All are reserving time for each domain (time, placement). For example, Geremy reserves weekend for families, Brune reserves some time with her husband on evenings, Paul and Sarah clearly reserve time for private activities. Marine, Brune, Paul and Sarah also do not have lunch with colleagues (people, placement). They also six all set limits on their working hours in the evening by having all an idea of a working time between 8 and 18 (time, placement). Brune will truy not to check email after 20:00. Geremy will work when kids are asleep. Marine, Brune, Paul and Sarah segment people by not talking about other domain than the primarily domain the interlocutor is related with (People, placement). In that regards, Thibault is nowadays facing more transcendence issue and thus adapts his behaviour in line with the domain he is physically present. For example, with Thara, they did not as couple in the firm. Paul is adapting the subjects of conversation with people according to the domain spatially defined, the interaction take place (People, transcendence). Finally, segmentation is made to enable thoughts not to cross over. This is made via ritual entrance such as the change of clothes and the shower of Marine (cognition, placement) or by developing enriching private time such as for Sarah, Paul and Geremy (cognition, transcendence).

Few integrating activities are also daily based. Their aim is more largely more to transcend boundaries. In terms of work/non-work, it is about the use of technology to work in places other than one’s traditional office such as for Brune and Geremy or to bridge the distance between central the domains such as for Thibault and the use of sms with Thara or Marine and the use of phone with Matthieu. It is central to notice that daily integration is seen as “simple” to obtain through the use of technology. It is seen as simple to “open” a computer or to “open” emails wherever one is. It is also easy to start conversation with people with whom we share common interests. In conclusion, it can be said that the level of intention for such activities is lower than for segmentation activities.

**Long-term work/non-work activities.**

Three main types of activities underline long-term objectives in how life domains should be placed so that transcendence is possible. One’s intention and willingness in managing boundaries especially one’s intention to place boundaries leads to proactively search for work/non-work activities in order to have them fulfilled these long-term objectives. Such activities strikingly aim more at integrating to reach emotional balance and a sense of well-being.

First, it is about spatially placing one’s main domains close to each other. This relates to Marine, Thibault and Paul who are all experiencing an unintentional separation between their work domain and at least one of their central domains. The three express the need to make these domains physically closer because having them one close to another is essential for their well-being. For Marine, it is being close to Mathieu and to her gang of friends and being part of the gang as she had been before. This will enable more emotional connection with her friends, more emotional sharing and will help her to alleviate part of her stress and strain. This placement leads to one overall activity namely “finding a work in Maname. For Thibault, it is also being close to her loved one, Thara and the kids for whom affection and emotions are growing. He can, however, not enact such emotions. Finding a common new house is central to Thara but also to him. This is maybe a step towards his feeling of having a family at last. This will be their home and not her house. For Paul, it is also about being close to someone, who is in fact “him”: his daughter Paola. It is about getting close to Paola that he looks for relocation in his company. He looks for a place which will be physically close to Irysland or a place from where Irysland is easily reachable by
air flight. One main difference between Paul and the two other storytellers is that for Thibault and Marine, the separation is more complete than for Paul who has in Pilang a social life and part of family life. This thus leads him not to pursue his alternatives to move.

Second, it is about placing boundaries to develop a “new” domain that in the long term is essential for one’s life. This is for example the case of Sarah and Brune. On the one hand, Sarah developed a strong strategy to contrast work and non-work. She shows to others the contrast between work and non-work via integrative activities such as being the same person, showing emotions or not being afraid to show her disagreement. She adopts integrating activities reinforce authenticity in both domains. This is made to place her non-work domain in life. Until now it was only here to support work and compensate work, but with retirement it can become her main domain. Her integrative activities are thus long-term oriented as they enhance a sense of well-being and prepare a future change. On the other hand, Brune tries to place temporal boundaries in a long-term perspective. This relates to her role as spouse and as daughter. She needs to find a new way to place temporal boundaries around her couple life as the kids will leave and she wants to prepare the fact that she and her husband will again be alone. She also realises that she need to be more present with her mother and may have to redraw boundaries here, too. Both relate to her travelling and her yearly schedule that become essential to manage these changes in a longer term.

Third, it is about placing emotional and psychosomatic boundaries. This relates mainly to Marine who takes a decision about herself and finally regarding her attempt to “be natural”. She thereof decides to alter some of her rather segmenting work/non-work activities. This is mostly to enable her to be the same person in both domains. Such “self-decision” is important for her activities that become long-term integrative activities to make more harmony between domains possible. It is also enacted into her search for work.

To conclude, this suggests that segmenting mostly refer to a daily strategy whereas integrating may mostly be seen as a long-term strategy. This indicates two contexts for each strategy where in the “daily” context segmentation is “better” than “integration”. This is perhaps in line with Kossek (2003, p. 14) who indicates that “there may be times when setting boundaries between work and home and structure may be desirable”, these time may include the “daily time”. Daily segmenting and long-term integrating are connected in individual’s work/non-work experiences. This is in line with most of the coping strategies for stress where segmenting enables restoration (See Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005; Sonnentag & Kruel, 2006) and with the enrichment theory between work and non-work (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

7. SEGMENTING AND INTEGRATING FOR INDIVIDUALS’ WORK/NON-WORK EXPERIENCE

Back to the original question of this paper namely: “what is an effective management of the work/non-work boundaries”. Is it about segmenting OR integrating one’s domains or is it about segmenting AND integrating? Three learning can be presented.

First, after analysing individuals’ work/non-work experiences, it becomes clear that segmentation AND integration are BOTH valued but to different degrees for each individual. The analysis clearly leads to consider the complementariness of segmenting and integrating rather than a dilemma between segmenting and integrating”. Second, segmentation is daily valued and daily managed through the development and management of temporal, human spatial and cognitive boundaries. It avoids critical blurring between one’s major life domains. Daily segmenting is mostly intentional. Daily segmenting relates to a certain focus on placement activities. Based on Nippert-Eng (1996), the focus on placement implies that domains are rather permeable. One further explanation for daily segmentation is the overall societal context. It seems that these middle-managers are living in a contemporary society that they perceived to be organised around the idea of integration. Technology is also seen as clear factor rendering work portable which underlines the conclusion of Valcour and Hunter (2005). In the eyes of the storytellers, such a contemporary context renders domains permeable so that they face a certain high level of permeability that should be handled for them. This is expressed by Marine for whom integration
and blending are perceived as a norm in the organisation and by Sarah for whom integration is the societal norms. This is also expressed for the specific boundary for which individuals seek segmentation. This is crucial for Geremy who express no difficulties in integration or for Sarah who on the contrary perceive this social norm as constraints. The daily activities enable to clarify domains and how one shall transit between both. Hall and Richter (1988) already notice the importance of daily transitions between work and home. Ashforth et al. (2000) build later on this argument and present a theoretical frame to understand daily transitions. Nippert-Eng (1996) focuses on daily boundary work and activities related to such boundary work. Third, integration is valued and managed on the long-term. It is reached by assuring that central life domains are spatially close to one another and that individuals do not suffer from emotional dissonance of being two diverse persons in different domains. Integration makes crossing simpler and is in the long term a source of energy and enrichment in an individual’s life as a whole. Long-term integration is largely more intentional and more proactive. This relates closely to the macro transitions as touched upon by Ashforth et al. (2000).

As a whole, having different roles, segmentation and integration are no longer opposed but are complementary for one’s individual experiences. This is also reinforcing the patterns of preferences presented before. Both aspects converge towards the complementariness of the segmenting and integrating processes. An effective management of boundary is thus about segmenting AND integrating work/non-work boundaries so that reaching long-term objectives of integration requires a daily segmentation.

8. CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Based on the conclusion above, it is noticeable that complementariness of the segmenting and integrating processes is essential but however not always perceivable in the segmentation-integration continuum as presented in figure 13 (at the end of this paper). Therefore, I suggest a three-dimensional model for work/non-work preferences, taking into account the complementariness of segmentation and integration but also the level of explicitness of the preference that become central. The three-dimensional model of work non-work preferences is a contribution to the boundary perspective. Considering the nuances between integration and segmentation may help to better understand individuals’ work/non-work conflict. Such nuances are suggested in regards to how the three dimensions (segmenting preference, integrating preference and level of explicitness) interact. This model contributes to the boundary perspective since it is the first time that integration and segmentation are clearly placed as two complementary processes. Even if one could argue that such complementariness may have been implicit in the continuum while considering position besides the extreme, their relations were however not as so evident. This model more clearly indicates that preferences are never pure integration and integration. This model undermines the “either/or” interpretation that one may have of the continuum and opens up for a “and” view on segmenting and integrating. This clarity is additionally associated in a systematic manner with the level of explicitness which has never been developed in the work/non-work literature. The level of explicitness becomes essential as long as boundaries are socially developed. The clarity is also supported by the twofold objectives of the work/non-work experience. Such objectives give truth to Ashforth et al. (2000) in the complementariness of segmentation and integration. It is also revealed that reaching long-term integration between life domains is a long-term process; hence it is essential have to a better sense of the equilibrium. Such long-term objectives require in our contemporary society to segment daily some central boundaries. Connecting both gives once again depth to individuals’ work/non-work experiences and undermines the dual view in the work-life field.

This model based on the interaction between segmenting preference, integrating preference and level of explicitness leads to five major archetypes where none of them is extreme on segmentation or integration and where their long-term and daily objectives could be integrated. Such archetypes are also a contribution to the work-life research. They also represent practical implications. The first is towards individuals who can maybe better recognise their situation in such more defined archetypes. The second is towards HR and HR managers in charge of work-life issues. This model clearly indicates that neither segmentation nor integration could be organisational answer and that at least five archetypes could be found. HR managers must thus start to “actively listen” to employees’ work/non-work experiences to...
start to “enable” individuals to effectively manage their work/non-work boundaries. The recognition of these archetypes may help them in their analysis of individuals’ work/non-work needs and in the design of their work/non-work policies. Focusing on specific preferences and their daily or long-term objectives, HR managers may realise that time and space are not the clues or keys to manage work/non-work balance. It is central to understand that flexibility of time and space is not what is going to enable people to resolve their work/non-work issues. This is due to the fact that temporal boundaries become blurry while their segmentation on a daily basis is central for people. Then space is neither the central boundary in one’s work/non-work preferences, in one’s boundary work nor boundary management. One central issue is the human boundaries, as well as the cognitive and behavioural boundaries. It is in that regards that it is important to review policies and mostly our social practices to enable such aspects to be carried in organisation. These aspects may be essential to render policies accessible to individuals and to render workplace attractive.

I would conclude by indicating that actively listening to individuals through their work/non-work self-narratives and by better understanding them with relevant interpretation grid, HR managers will actively and positively participate in the development of “family-acting” corporate culture. HR will become the guardian of human values and human diversity in regards to work and non-work. HR will finally lives up to the “Human” in the HR.
1- 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.

2- 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.

3- 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.

4- 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.

5- Individuals with an overall *balanced preference* value integration for some of their specific preference and segmentation for other specific boundaries. Such overall preference is moderately explicit.

Figure 13 - A three-dimensional model of individuals’ work/non-work preferences
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