

Facing institutional heterogeneity through socialization tactics and organizational identity; the case of new comers in hybrid organizations

Emilie Barges

Assistant Professor of HRM and Organizational Theory

Clermont Graduate School of Management

28th colloquium EGOS, Helsinki, Finlande, July 5-7.

Abstract

Co-habitation of contradictory institutional logics is a key issue in institutional organizational theory and it is of a great importance in hybrid organizations. Indeed, this type of organization do not have stabilized institutional supports to construct compromises between institutional logics. Several authors have shown that a central issue for managing institutional pluralism in hybrid organizations is to socialize newcomers. If we know the importance of socializing new recruits, we do not know how these organizations act in practice. This article capitalizes on the literature on organizational socialization and offers a set of propositions to capture the socialization process in hybrid organizations We show that a key issue for hybrid organization to survive is to develop an organization identity and instil values into newcomers through socialization tactics. We contribute in this research to a better understanding of institutional work when organizations face heterogeneous institutional environments.

Keys words

Institutional logic, hybrid organization, socialization tactics, compromises, organization identities, institutionalisation

Facing institutional heterogeneity through socialization tactics and organizational identity; the case of new comers in hybrid organizations

Emilie Bargues

Assistant Professor of HRM and Organizational Theory
Clermont Graduate School of Management

We're looking for five-legged sheep able to deal simultaneously with both very technical social and economic issues for which no training exists.

Introduction

This sentence from an interview with a manager in a temporary work integration enterprise directly echoes a theoretical issue at the heart of studies on hybrid organizations (Battilana & Dorrado, 2010) and the management of institutional pluralism. Indeed, one of the central characteristics of hybrid organizations is that they face heterogeneous – in certain cases even heterogeneous - institutional logics¹ and that stabilizing an organizational compromise so as to satisfy all these logics at the same time is particularly delicate (Glynn, 2000; Battilana & Dorrado, 2010; Pache & Santos, 2010, 2011). This co-habitation of contradictory institutional logics and creation of an organizational compromise is more problematic as the combinations hybrid organizations propose are idiosyncratic by definition, and in striking a balance, hybrid organizations have no stabilized institutional supports to guide them. If, as Stinchcombe underlines, creating a new activity is always risky (Stinchcombe, 1960), creating an organization that combines contradictory institutional logics is even more complex (Scott &

¹Institutional logics are generally defined as cultural beliefs and rules that structure the actors' outlook and behaviour (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton, 2004; Lounsbury, 2007). Institutional logics are shared socially and convey the values that form frameworks for reasoning but also criteria of legitimacy for organizing social action in time and space (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008); they are embedded in practices and ideas, and structure the rules of the social game (Dunn & Jones, 2010). The family, democracy, and Christianity are classic instances of institutional logics that traverse society and provide the actors with organizational values and schemas.

Meyer, 1991) because hybrid organizations do not have any models and templates to deal with and solve institutional conflicts (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Battilana & Dorrado, 2010).

Pache and Santos have shown in their study on French temporary work integration enterprises that the response of a hybrid organization to conflicts of institutional logics depends on the political support the members of the organization will give to the various institutional logics (Pache & Santos, 2010, 2011). The organization's response is the fruit of a political compromise between the various members of the organization who support one institutional logic or another. In a similar but more descriptive perspective way, Battilana and Dorado show that the presence of competing institutional logics generates important identity tensions inside the organization between the individuals enacting and supporting these institutional logics (Battilana & Dorado, 2010). In such cases integrating these competing logics involves quite specific recruitment and socialization processes so as to co-ordinate the various individuals who represent the logics in conflict. They also suggest – as a direct continuation of Selznick's line of research that these organization need to create an organizational identity that combine the two institutional logics and offers a symbolic answer to institutional heterogeneity (Selznick, 1949, 1957; Battilana & Dorado, 2010). The aim of creating this identity is not to suppress the tensions between the institutional logics but to provide a common receptacle in which the individuals who support the different logics will be able to pacify their relations and find a cognitive and symbolic space in which to transcend the institutional conflicts (Selznick, 1957; Kraats & Bloch, 2008). Pache and Santos confirm the salience of the cognitive and identity mechanism by showing that inside hybrid organizations the competing logics are reconciled on the level of the objectives but result in important tensions on the practical level thereby exposing the social integration to potentially contradictory organizational templates (Pache & Santos, 2011).

This characteristic makes hybrid organizations particularly sensitive as to how new comers integrate and how they socialize inside the organization (Battilana & Dorado, 2010). If a new comer does not share the organization's values or perturbs the internal political and symbolic equilibrium the whole organization is jeopardized. This explains why the processes of socialization and recruitment are particularly important in these types of organisations as this is when the members of the organization will select individuals sharing the same values and work on how they see the world - so that they will support the organisation's activity and institutionalisation.

Whilst from a logical and empirical point of view the authors working on hybrid organizations have identified the importance of recruitment and socialization processes, not much, on the other hand, is known about how these organizations handle the socialization of their new comers. How do they act on the way the new comers see the world? Do formal, or rather informal, socialization processes exist? Are the individuals recruited accompanied and trained during the socialization phase? Are there any formal mechanisms to transform the identities of new comers and align it to the values and mission of the hybrid organization? Faced with the crucial importance of socialization processes in hybrid organizations and the absence of systematic answers as to the socialization tactics these organisations may employ, we propose in this article to capitalize on the literature on organizational socialization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Ashford & Sacks, 1996) in order to evaluate the practices identified by the most recent studies on socialization in hybrid organizations but also to underline the characteristics of these organizations. Thus our research aims to improve the comprehension of the socialization tactics implemented in and by hybrid organizations to reinforce instead of disturbing the organizational, political and symbolic equilibrium attained between the competing institutional logics.

In the first part of the article we will present the main issues associated with socialization in hybrid organizations. We will focus on research on organizational socialization and explain what are the main effects of socialization tactics on organizational identity and value internalization. We will see that hybrid organizations need to develop a symbolic management that starts with the socialization of new comers. In the second part of our article, we focus on socialization tactics in hybrid organizations and we propose a set of propositions. At last, we present what are the main research perspectives that this theoretical work could generate.

The aim of this piece of research, therefore, is to specify the socialization tactics used in hybrid organizations and in this way help deepen comprehension of how this very special type of organization works. We thereby seek to enhance understanding of the functioning of this type of organisation which - confronted with a generalized market economy driven by the logic of profits - innovates and proposes alternatives in order to alleviate and make up for the shortcomings of markets and nation States. This study is also of interest for the literature concerning organizational socialization as the innovations that can be observed in hybrid organizations may potentially throw a new light on socialization in more conventional organizations, i.e. that have mediating structures in their fields for dealing with institutional heterogeneity. It also provides concrete lines of investigation for thinking about institutional

change when one dominant institutional logic is contested and replaced by another. In this way a subtler comprehension of the tactics of socialization clarifies the dynamics behind how organisations change as well as institutional work. This study also has the merit of highlighting the importance of symbolic management in hybrid organizations, whose survival depends on a quasi-mystical belief in the importance of the organization's mission – a belief that joins the members of the organization together and enables them to keep going in a highly heterogeneous institutional environment.

Part 1- The issues of socialization in hybrid organizations

We return in this first part to the essential scientific knowledge that has been acquired from research on organizational socialization in relation to organizational identity and internalization of values (1.1) and more specifically we will highlight the issues involved in socialization within the particular case of hybrid organizations (1.2).

1.1- Organizational socialization: processes, sequences and consequences in terms of organizational identity and internalization of values

Organizational socialization is defined traditionally as a process that leads an individual to acquire what the knowledge he needs to carry out a task and adjust to a new work context (Fisher, 1986; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). It involves acquiring beliefs, values, forms of behavior, orientations, skills, competences and everything the individual needs to perform his new role and his new function in the organization (Fisher, 1986; Van Maanen, 1976). This process of internalization of values, beliefs, and knowledge is continuous throughout an individual's career within an organization, but much more obvious because more intense and problematic during an organizational transition - and most especially when the individual joins the organization (Schein, 1971). During his socialization an individual adapts and adjusts to the organization (its rules, its conventions), to his job (its tasks, methods, procedures, techniques etc), to the social group of which he becomes a member, but he also adapts his person since the organizational socialization determines how his personal identity is constructed (Fisher, 1986, Holton, 1996). Thus, organizational socialization is the principal process whereby an organization's values and culture are transmitted and results in the individual's skills and values being adjusted to those of the organization (Schein, 1968, Van Maanen, 1976; Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

The socialization process also plays a full part in the dynamics of constructing an organizational identity defined as “*the extent to which an individual defines himself or herself in terms of the organization and what it is perceived to represent*” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). According to these authors this organizational identity must be distinguished from the internalization of values and beliefs since it refers to the definition of self in terms of social category (“I am”), whereas internalization involves incorporating values, attitudes and so forth within the self as guiding principles (“I believe”). In other words, if certain values and attitudes are typically associated with the member of an organization, accepting this organization as defining oneself is something different that brings the individual to define himself and perceive unconsciously the environment in terms of his organization’s values, beliefs, and conventions (“We are, we do”). For Simon organizational identification is “*the process whereby the individual substitutes the organization’s objectives for his own thereby changing the criteria that determine his decisions inside the organization*”, in this way the new recruit comes to acquire an “*organizational personality*” distinct from his individual personality and makes his decisions compatible with the objectives of the organization. Through the process of identification, the organization “*imposes on the individual its system of social values and eliminates his personal motivations*” (Simon, 1945).

According to Ashforth and Mael (1989), organizational socialization acts directly on the organizational identification of the new recruits which in turn influences the internalization of the organization’s values and beliefs². Thus, organizational socialization can be seen as an attempt to symbolically manage newcomers’ self, if not situational, definitions by defining the organization or subunit in terms of distinctive and enduring central properties. Organizational socialization therefore constitutes a key moment in symbolic management that consists in transmitting the organizational identity or at least the managerial representations of this identity (Pfeffer, 1981) by means of manipulating symbols such as traditions, myths, metaphors, rituals, sagas, heroes, and the physical framework (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). In this respect, Ashforth and Mael distinguish two broad categories of organizations: holographic organizations in which all the individuals share the same organizational identity and ideographic organizations in which the individuals have organizational identities that vary

² There can, however, be internalization of the organization’s values without any development of an organizational identity. In this case the individual keeps a distance between his value system and the organization’s value system. The collective and individual value systems overlap without coinciding.

according to the sub-parts of the organization they are attached to (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Asforth & Mael, 1989).

The specialized authors underline that this process of creating an organizational identity results in a process that reifies/institutionalizes the organization and tends to give it a psychological existence. This reification covers a double phenomenon of affirming and deepening the organizational identity (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). The organization appears as an impersonal and objective entity distinct from the individuals of which it is made up and invested with an autonomous will. The members interiorize this autonomous identity and will incorporate it in their individual identity. This reification process gives the organization a new dimension by endowing it with a 'personality of its own' that is incorporated in the subjectivity and identity of the individual quite independently of the interactions the latter may or may not have with other members of the organization. So socialization is a key moment in the functioning of an organization as this is the moment at which the newcomer will reify the organization, give it a real psychological existence based on which he will define himself and commit himself to co-operating socially or instead reject the organization and its value system. Socialization corresponds to the moment when the organization installs itself in the individual's psyche by modeling the structures of his personality.

Thus, it is apparent that independently or together with the construction of an organizational identity (identification), the socialization process constitutes a key moment for expressing, sharing, and diffusing the organization's values and beliefs (internalization). It is a key moment that will enable the new recruits to detect the distinctive signs by which they will recognize one another as different from those outside the organization and as similar to those inside the group. During the socialization stage a distinction is established between the inside and the outside but it is also during this phase that the new recruits will acquire the cognitive templates through which they will interpret the environment of the organization and its evolution.

Apart from its effects on internalizing values and organizational identity, the literature on socialization has also looked into the socialization practices and strategies set up by organizations. It is often described as fragmented (Fisher, 1986; Wanous & Colella, 1989). A so-called sequential approach, however, attempted to produce a general theory searching to identify all the factors and results of this process (Wanous, 1992). Owing to the extreme complexity of the models and the limits of its empirical research it did not succeed (Fisher,

1986), but it remains nonetheless an essential approach for understanding the phenomenon (Saks & Ashforth, 2007). These studies describe how the socialization evolves over time, the various sequences that characterize it and which follow and overlap one another (Schein, 1968; Feldman, 1976, 1981; Wanous, 1980), and they set out each stage of the activities carried out by the individual and his psychological state - as well as certain actions implemented by the organization. In these models the number of stages identified is generally three (Fisher, 1986):

- The anticipated socialization that takes place before the recruit joins the organization marked by both parties formulating their expectations and anticipations,
- The initial confrontation marked by the “*reality shock*” the recruit experiences, by his state of stress and by the emergence of a “*role conflict*” and a “*role ambiguity*” (Kahn et al., 1964),
- The mutual acceptance marked by the passage from the status of *outsider* to *insider* by resolving conflicts and ambiguities and affirming an identity that adapts to the organization’s culture, standards and working rules.

The sequential approach to organizational socialization exploits the process’s indicators of success. These are first of all forms of behavior such as performing one’s role exactly with a minimum of trouble, staying in the organization, innovating and co-operating to achieve organizational goals (Feldman, 1981). Next come attitudes such as job satisfaction, motivation, involvement in and commitment to the organization (Feldman, 1981). More recent studies would introduce other indicators of the results of socialization such as the cohesion of the professional culture (Grant & Bush, 2001), the construction of an organizational identity and the internalization of the organization’s values (Ashforth & Saks, 1996).

1.2- The issues of socialization in hybrid organizations: constructing a specific organizational identity and instilling values in the new recruits

We have seen that hybrid organizations, by definition, have no templates nor institutional supports and cannot “*count on a reservoir of candidates with experience in combining institutional logics*” (Battilana & Dorado, 2010, p. 1420). The social, economic, and political innovation the hybrid organization proposes is so great that no competence is available on the

job market. There are very few individuals with the experience and skills necessary for marrying institutional logics together. Hybrid organizations must therefore socialize new recruits while taking care not to deteriorate their skills and making sure their value systems are compatible with the identity values of the organization. The whole difficulty and paradox of hybrid organizations comes from the fact that the individuals recruited often have particular skills and identities in one field - a specific institutional logic – and that they may well be in opposition to another logic present in the same organization. As the combination of institutional logics is new it is up to the hybrid organization to ensure the individuals modulate their identities and working methods. If one takes the case of micro-credit, these organizations have to make individuals with very different skills and identities work together: detecting and supporting disadvantaged persons (social workers) versus solvability analysis and commercial development (bankers). The whole issue for hybrid organizations is to maintain individuals' skills while at the same time making sure they will tolerate values that are at first sight very different from one another.

Taking their nature and the tensions traversing them into account there is a real risk that one institutional logic wins the upper hand over the other as there is no source of mediation outside the organization that could hold the logics together. So hybrid organizations are particularly unstable and a permanent effort is needed to keep an organizational, political, and symbolic balance between the various institutional logics. One of the means identified by the research on institutional logics and the solutions found by organizations faced with complexity and institutional pluralism is to define an organizational identity that transcends identity and institutional conflicts and allows them to be surmounted (Selznick, 1949, 1957; Glynn, 2008; Kraatz & Block, 2008; Pache & Santos, 2010, 2011; Battilana & Dorrado, 2010).

Thus, Kraatz & Block have shown organizations confronted with heterogeneous institutional environments may adopt four types of behavior to deal with institutional heterogeneity (Kraatz & Block, 2008):

- eliminating pluralism: which comes down to denying the validity of the demands the stakeholders express; this denial also involves activating political and symbolic policies in house to silence the institutional supports. In the case of a hybrid organization this means suppressing an institutional logic and *de facto* entailing the disappearance of the organization,

- compartmentalizing: its aim is to respond to the institutional expectations independently via the creation of organizational units that prove commitment to different institutional logics. This strategy can result – but not in every case - in practices of uncoupling. In the case of the hybrid organization this amounts to cutting the organization in two with one part of the organization dealing with one institutional logic and the other with the second. In such a case there is a disappearance of the hybrid organization that no longer combines both logics but deals with them separately,

- Looking for a compromise between the various expectations and setting up a co-operation approach. In such a case the organization is a mediator between the various institutional logics that are expressed in its environment. In this situation the hybrid organization becomes a platform and offers resources to external members so that they can face the institutional pluralism.

- Institutionalization, i.e. creating a one-off organization that combines different institutional logics idiosyncratically and transcends the conflicting interests. Here Kraatz and Block explicitly return to Selznick's work. In Selznick's view, the end result of the institutionalization process is the emergence of an autonomous and unique "*organizational self*" (Selznick, 1957, p. 21). Selznick does not see institutionalization "*as a process that somehow extracts the organization from its constraining external context, or as one that negates the local identities and parochial aims of its constituencies. To the contrary, he paradoxically argues that the organization's acceptance of irreversible commitments is the very cornerstone of institutionalization*" (Kraatz & Block, 2008). The Selznickian organizational institution is "*infused with value*" by its constituents and it is institutionalized only in so much as it becomes the vehicle through which these groups pursue their aspirations and their ideals. While it develops a logic of its own and attains the ability to give identity to its members, it accepts identities and logics from them in at least equal measure (Kraatz & Block, 2008).

Only the last strategy is plausible for hybrid organizations. The issue for this type of organization is to set up an idiosyncratic identity and value system that transcend the competing institutional logics and offer to the organization's members who support one logic or another a cognitive space that makes the cohabitation of both institutional logics intelligible

and necessary. The hybrid organization then produces its own institutional logic containing cultural beliefs and rules that structure how its members see the world and their forms of behavior - rules and beliefs characterized by affirming that transcending conflicts between institutional logics is possible and desirable. Thus the hybrid organization's identity is characterized by a strong belief in transcending conflicts of values and that a practical alternative can emerge. This institutionalizing approach involves reifying the hybrid organization and a psychological existence that will serve as a support for defining the new recruits' identity.

It can be seen then that hybrid organizations are held together by their identities which are very specific. The capacity to construct and maintain an organizational identity that transcends conflicts of institutional logics is what enables these organizations to endure in time and space and fulfill their missions in an institutional environment uncertain as to these missions' validity and future. So the importance of socialization in this type of organization can be understood - an importance that is double. On the one hand, care should be taken that the socialization of the new recruits does not disturb the organizational identity but on the contrary helps reinforce it. The socialization stage is also important because it is during this period that the newcomers adjust their values and knowledge to a work context characterized by a strong ambiguity and lack of institutionalized landmarks to guide how they should act. It is during this stage that the organization's future members familiarize themselves with its institutional complexity and develop their own interpretive templates. It is the stage for internalizing values. It is also the stage during which the organization's members set up a symbolic management resulting in a more or less substantial modulation of the new recruits' identities making them compatible or not with the values of the hybrid organization's mission. This is the construction of an organizational identity. When it succeeds, socialization of new recruits results in their adjusting to the hybrid organization's values and beliefs and the creation of an organizational identity.

The particularity of hybrid organizations is that they cannot socialize without seeking to modify the new members' identity and create an organizational identity since believing in the organization's values and missions is what 'holds together' the competing institutional logics within an uncertain and institutional environment. But at the same time constructing this organizational identity has to maintain the identity of the individuals in a state that allows them to conform to an institutional logic on penalty of hindering the mission of the organization. So the hybrid organization is both holographic – all the members must share the

organization's values and the importance of the mission - and ideographic - the organizational identities vary depending on the institutional logics to which the members are attached (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Asforth & Mael, 1989). For us the issue now is to improve our understanding how this type of organization manages socialization processes with contradictory purposes: preserving the new recruits' skills and identity while at the same time creating a strong organizational identity so that the organization continues and institutionalizes in an uncertain environment.

Part 2. How to structure socialization in hybrid organizations?

In this second part, we return specifically to the impact the socialization tactics set up by a hybrid organization have on the maintenance of an organizational identity in time and space as well as on instilling the organization's values and beliefs in new recruits. We return to the essential findings in the subject of organizational socialization and we apply them to the particular case of hybrid organizations via a set of propositions concerning the socialization tactics these organizations can put in place.

Research in the field of organizational socialization developed in the middle of the 1970s specifically focuses on the actions and tactics implemented by an organization to structure the adjustment process of new recruits (Van Maanen, 1978). The objective is to throw light on *“the ways in which the experiences of an individual in transition from one role to another are structured from him by others in the organization”* (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979: 34-35). Here the recruit is essentially perceived as reacting to the socialization tactics developed by the organization. This first series of studies was subsequently completed by interactionist studies in order to improve understanding of the active role of new recruits in their own socialization through highlighting their strategies for finding information and other socialization strategies (particularly Jones, 1983, Nicholson, 1984, Miller & Jablin, 1991; Comer, 1991; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Morrison, 1993; Ashford & Black, 1996).

The studies of Van Maanen and Schein (1979) appear as the central pillar of the studies into socialization practices inside organizations. These two authors identify six types of socialization tactics that enable organisations to be characterised depending on the way they treat their recruits' socialization. The authors underline the tactics are selected consciously or unconsciously by the organization's management – in other words, selected by choice or

accidentally. Each type of tactic is characterized by a pair representing the extremes of a continuum.

Table 1. Typology of the continuums of organizational socialization tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979)

Formal Tactics VS Informal Tactics
Individual Tactics VS Collective Tactics
Sequential Tactics VS Random Tactics
Fixed Tactics VS Variable Tactics
Serial tactics VS Unconnected Tactics
Investiture Tactics VS Divestiture Tactics

These tactics are not mutually exclusive but can be simultaneous and combined, and it can happen that their effects reinforce, neutralize, or conflict with one another (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979)³.

Collective v. individual tactics

The first type of tactics - “collective” versus “individual” - refers to the fact that the newcomers live through a series of common experiences together or, on the contrary, are isolated and live through unique experiences independently of the other recruits. The authors make an analogy with producing in series or by the unit – the first giving a relatively uniform result. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) identify the possible consequences of the collective tactics. They develop among the recruits the consciousness of being “*in the same boat*” and contribute to the formation of a quasi sub-world within the organization. In this way, these

³ Knowledge of the contents of socialisation tactics have not been enriched since the founding studies of Van Maanen and Schein (1979) although they recognise the non-exhaustive character of their typology and urge their investigations to be taken further. Though numerous other studies take an interest in organisations’ socialisation tactics they focus on the causal relationships between the various types of tactics identified by these two authors exclusively. Some study their effects on the recruits’ attitudes to their work such as job satisfaction or organisational commitment (Baker, 1989; Zahrlly & Tosi, 1989; Baker & Feldman, 1991; Mignerey, Rubin & Gorden, 1995). Others measure their effect in what concerns the “individual-job”, “individualorganisation”, and “individual-group” match (Chatman, 1989; Saks & Ashforth, 1996; Cooper-Thomas, Van Vianen & Anderson, 2004; Cable & Parsons, 2001, Kim & al., 2005; Perrot, 2009). Jones has proposed a work of synthesis; he deduces that the six dimensions of Van Maanen and Schein (1979) are only the reflection of a single overall polarity unique between institutionalized and individualized tactics.

tactics tend to take place in organizations concerned to construct a collective sense of identity, solidarity and loyalty within the cohort group being socialized. Both authors underline collective tactics risk a loss of homogeneity in values between the members of the organization as they can lead to constructing a specific collective sub-identity in the new recruit group. This group acts as a constraint on the individual and can lead to phenomena of rebellion and collective deviation from the standards.

Individual tactics are found in organizations in which the construction of a collective identity for the recruits is less important than learning the operational specificities required by the role with which they are entrusted. With individual socialization the members already in place have more control over the recruits and the exercise of the concrete activity.

Taking their specificities into account hybrid organizations must quite logically rely on both collective and individual tactics. Collective, since it is a method for communicating the organization's values to the new recruits and making them feel they are in the same boat. This means participating in the reification of the organization, making the organization's values and the importance of its mission explicit so as to foster the creation of an organizational identity. But the collective socialization tactic can in no case be enough as it risks confining the new recruits in a particular group on the margin of the organization; in such a case more individual tactics should be relied on to organize a transfer of experience and skills concerning the unique expertise of the hybrid organization to make competing institutional logics cohabit.

Proposition 1: *Hybrid organizations alternate collective and individual socialization tactics to socialize the new recruits.*

Formal versus informal tactics

The second type of socialization tactic corresponds to “formal” versus “informal” tactics. Formal tactics consist in conceiving of work experiences, training experiences, situations or again of producing signs (uniforms, badges) that mark out the recruits from the other members of the organization. On the other hand, informal tactics consist in having the recruits live identical experiences to those of the members in place. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) note formal tactics are found in organizations in which it is important for the newcomer to learn the “correct” attitudes, and values and protocols associated with his role. They point out, “formal tactics concentrate more upon attitude than act”. However, if the formal socialization

is to work the instructors' legitimacy must be very important in the eyes of the recruits. Moreover, the authors observe that the formal socialization is often a first sequence in the socialization process followed by a second informal sequence. Some of the learning and adjustments specific to the organizational socialization occur when the recruit is in a normal working situation and cannot be distinguished from the other members of the enterprise. A disillusion in relation to the formal socialization may set in causing the newcomer to disregard virtually everything learned in the formal socialization processes.

Hybrid organizations prefer to rely on formal socialization tactics that map out the newcomers' socialization process so that they become familiar with the work context and the organization's mission and values. The formalization of the socialization avoids the risk that certain members of the organization take over more of the socialization of the new recruits than the others and thereby favour one institutional logic at the expense of another. Formalising the socialization process diminishes the political risk and thus contributes to keeping the balance between the institutional logics.

Proposition 2: *Hybrid organizations make use of formal socialization tactics to socialize the new recruits.*

Sequential versus random tactics

The third type of tactics corresponds to the "sequential" and "random" tactics. It concerns the socialization of individuals during their career within an organization marked by various transitions. For some roles in an organization the socialization process may cover a broad spectrum of assignments and experiences taking sometimes many years of preparation. With sequential tactics the organization knows the various stages that will mark the socialization of an individual and communicates to him, whereas with random tactics the progression is more ambiguous and not indicated to the recruit. The organization can for example identify various positions or missions to occupy successively in the organization before reaching a targeted role.

Hybrid organizations rely on sequential tactics so as to map out the newcomers' careers and ensure a progressive improvement in skills. These stages also have the aim of making sure the recruits really share the organization's values and that the more they acquire responsibilities and rise in the hierarchy the more they embody and diffuse the values of the organization.

Moving into different parts of the organization on different assignments enables the newcomers to increase their knowledge of the organization, the coherence of its values and missions, and how its institutional logics fit together. This improved knowledge of the organization engenders an affective and cognitive attachment to the organization which fosters their identification.

Proposition 3: *Hybrid organizations rely on sequential tactics to socialize new recruits.*

Fixed versus variable socialisation tactics

A fourth dimension concerns fixed versus variable tactics. In the framework of fixed tactics the stages of the socialization process are associated with a fixed calendar communicated to the recruit, whereas with “variable” tactics this calendar is inexistent. In other words, though the socialization sequences exist the times they take are not predefined but depend on the context. Here again the tactics essentially concern socialization throughout an individual’s career within an organization. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) note that careers in organizations are most often marked by variable socialization processes; for many uncontrollable factors such as the state of the economy or staff turnover influence the date at which a person is promoted to a higher level. Variable socialization implies individuals progressing at different rhythms and makes it difficult for cohort group to remain cohesive and loyal to one other. In order to ensure solidarity it is necessary to establish a fixed calendar for the socialization process.

Given the risk of tension produced by identity issues in hybrid organizations, fixing the lengths of socialization sequences helps promote solidarity and fairness inside the organization and minimize the risk of one institutional logic dominating the other. Thus, in the absence of uncontrollable factors, hybrid organizations rely on fixed socialization tactics.

Proposition 4: *Hybrid organizations rely on fixed tactics to socialize new recruits.*

Serial tactics versus unconnected tactics

The fifth type of serial *versus* unconnected tactics refers to whether the newcomer is accompanied or not by a more experienced member who assumes a relatively similar position in the organization and acts as a model for the recruit. In the framework of “unconnected” tactics the recruits have no model to follow to help them fulfill their role. Serial tactics produce a remarkable intergenerational stability of patrolmen behavior patterns. Serial mode

create something analogous to Mead's (1956) notion of "post-figurative culture". Nonetheless, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) indicate that if the mentor's image is undesirable the process becomes unconnected or leads to the recruit's departure. So it appears that serial tactics favor the construction of an organizational identity by guaranteeing a certain homogeneity in behavior and sharing of values.

Hybrid organizations prefer serial socialization tactics to foster the creation of an organizational identity and internalize values. This serial tactic makes it possible to alternate learning and socialization periods for the different institutional logics thereby enabling the new recruits to become more familiar with the specificities of their organization. Hybrid organizations are also careful in choosing the reference models who are to accompany the new recruits during the socialization taking care to maintain a balance between the bearers of different logics.

Proposition 5a: *Hybrid organizations rely on serial tactics to socialize their new recruits.*

Proposition 5b: *Hybrid organizations alternate serial tactics for each of the institutional logics.*

Proposition 5c: *Hybrid organizations choose their socializing agents with care to socialize the new recruits.*

Investiture versus divestiture tactics

"Investiture" versus "divestiture" tactics "refer to whether newcomers receive signs from insiders that affirms or disaffirms their identity" (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979, p. 64). Investiture processes ratify the newcomer's incoming identity and divestiture processes supplant the incoming identity with a new organizationally situated identity (Van Maanen, 1978). The purpose of investiture tactics is not to change the recruit but to make the most of the qualifications, values, and attitudes he already has. In the framework of divestiture tactics the recruit must modify certain elements in his identity. He must for instance give up certain forms of behaviour, must follow a series of rigid rules and regulations and must for instance sometimes go so far as to denigrate himself publically. In practice, divestiture tactics can take various forms - such as effacing the symbols of the newcomer's former identity, limiting the recruit's outside contacts or isolating him from them, depreciating his status, knowledge, and capacities; forcing him to accept new symbols; rigidly prescribing and proscribing his

behaviour and punishing infractions; and rewarding the emergence of a new identity (Fisher, 1986; Goffman, 1963, Van Maanen 1976, 1978).

This type of tactic is close to the phenomena of “mortification to self”, humiliation and profanation to self, Goffman (1961) observes in “total institutions”. In other terms, divestiture tactics shape the person. It is an effective way for the organization to control the newcomers’ values. This type of tactic ensures the recruit’s new identity is maintained, for the sacrifices put into the construction of this identity must be justified. The respect and admiration of his institution encourage the newcomer’s acceptance and motivation regarding these tactics. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) identify organizations that insist on this type of tactic: religious cult, elite law schools, professional athletic teams, military organization.

Divestiture/investiture tactics are particularly sensitive for hybrid organizations since they seek, as we have seen above, to maintain the newcomers’ identities and skills but also to share values and create an organizational identity that secures the organization’s survival in its institutional environment. This leads these organizations to strike a delicate balance between both investiture practices to benefit from the new recruits’ skills and knowledge and divestiture practices so as to ensure the newcomers develop an organizational identity. This balance entails pairing recruiting and socializing phases so as to be sure in advance that the new recruit has both the technical skills necessary and a sufficiently flexible identity and the desire to ‘commit himself to the adventure’ proposed by the hybrid organization.

Proposition 6a: *Hybrid organizations develop a balance between investiture and divestiture practices so as to socialize new recruits.*

Proposition 6b: *Hybrid organizations pair recruitment and socialization phases so as to select new recruits in phase with the values and mission of the organization.*

Implications for research

While research on hybrid organizations and institutional entrepreneurship tends to develop, few studies spend much time on the tactics and practices of socialization implemented by these organizations even though they appear to be important for their survival and development. A research plan could focus on four objectives.

In the first place, this work could be useful for better understanding of how socialization tactics impact on developing an organizational identity and internalization of values. The

organizational identity concept is well known in the theory of organizations and many authors propose variables for measuring the construct (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Given the importance of identity and value internalization for hybrid organizations our proposals for research could serve as a first base for a test study on the impact of socialization tactics on the construction of an organizational identity in the particular context of hybrid organizations.

A second more qualitative and longitudinal line of research might consist in observing the socialization tactics used by hybrid organizations as well as the specificities they develop. Many authors underline the non-exhaustivity of the practices revealed by earlier studies on socialization. Because this stage is important for hybrid organizations, studying the socialization tactics these types of organizations use could complete what is known about organizational socialization and enhance understanding of the phenomenon for more conventional organizations. We have seen that owing to their specificities hybrid organizations must act directly on the outlooks of individuals via investiture/divestiture practices. For this reason the hybrid organization is a field of research uniquely endowed for understanding this type of symbolic management, which is taking on a growing importance in contemporary organizations the running of which is more and more guided by values and less and less by hierarchical and bureaucratic considerations. Let us add that contemporary organizations are made up of individuals with plural identities that they introduce into their organizations thereby forcing them to open up to heterogeneous institutional logics and identities. All these factors contribute to increasing the relevance of symbolic management in organizations. As an extension to a study on symbolic management, this paper can also be useful for a clearer perception of the management of institutional pluralism and institutional work.

Conclusion

In a context of globalization and invasion by commercial rationality the studies on hybrid organizations and institutional entrepreneurship bear many hopes for understanding how organizations can succeed in dealing with failures by markets and States - as much in the nations of the North as in those of the South. Beyond the heroic figure of the institutional entrepreneur able to solve society's ills, it is inevitable that this new race of entrepreneurs should rely on organizations that manage to reconcile complex and at times contradictory expectations. These organizations are as yet little studied; one of the keys for the success of social entrepreneurs is to institutionalize their organizations effectively and so ensure their

perpetuation in an uncertain environment often hostile to their practices. This institutional work involves numerous processes including socialization. The perspective we propose suggests that:

1- The socialization tactics a hybrid organization sets up play a key role in the attempt to institutionalize since they ensure the new recruits adhere to the organization's values, beliefs, and missions via the internalization and identification processes;

2- Socialization tactics participate directly in the reification of the organization that acts as a base for a symbol management and for hardwiring the organization's objectives in the individuals' psyches.

Whilst the concept of socialization is little used in research on organizations, making use of it for the case of hybrid organizations highlights important phenomena in the ceaselessly renewed attempts to institutionalize itself that every organization has to make. It also brings a new perspective for thinking about institutional work and the management of institutional pluralism.

Bibliography