

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Namrata Malhotra (Imperial College London) and Trish Reay (University of Alberta)

Abstract

In this chapter we focus on the role of power associated with micro-foundations of organizational hybridity. We develop a framework that illuminates how key sources of power based on Buchanan and Badham (2008) and French and Raven (1959) manifest at the level of everyday work practices. Using this framework, we draw on existing studies concerning hybridity in professional organizations to illustrate how different forms of power come into play when actors guided by different logics engage in day to day professional work. Overall, we suggest that more attention to how micro level actors use different forms of power to support, hamper or alter different mechanisms to manage tensions among competing logics in everyday work is critical to improving our understanding about the microfoundations of institutionalism.

Key words: Institutional hybridity, power, professional work, hybrid roles, socialization practices, micro-foundations

Classification: Conceptual paper

In this chapter, we build on recent scholarship focused on the micro-foundations of institutional theory (Powell & Colyvas, 2008) and its impetus on how everyday workplace activities matter from an institutional perspective. As Powell and Rerup (2017) explain, “activities take form through micro-processes of organizational development, and mundane routine actions can have much larger consequences and become more broadly institutionalized” (p. 331-332). The complexity of this process comes into sharp focus in “hybrid” organizations where multiple institutional logics are simultaneously espoused and enacted by actors. In these situations, micro-level actions and their broader institutional ramifications are connected by the way front-line actors manage tensions while engaging with competing institutional logics – or institutional complexity (Greenwood, Raynard, Kodeih, Micelotta, & Lounsbury, 2011). We argue that closer attention to the role of power among such micro-level actors can enhance our understanding of how tensions are managed in everyday work practices when different actors are guided by different logics.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Institutional logics provide ‘rules of the game’ that guide the behaviours and daily activities of both organizations and individuals (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 112). In situations where multiple logics guide behaviour, tension and conflict are inevitable in the conduct of everyday work because it is difficult to know which rules of the game should be followed. Our context here is professional organizations, a vivid example of institutional hybridity in response to institutional complexity (e.g., Greenwood et al., 2011; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Dunn & Jones, 2010). Typically, professional, corporate and market logics co-exist and often compete in these organizations including healthcare, legal firms, banks and microfinance (Cooper, Hinings, Greenwood, & Brown, 1996; Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Reay & Hinings, 2009). Hybridity at the micro level is of particular salience to professional organizations because it is becoming the norm for different groups of professionals and managers, carrying different institutional logics, to work together while accommodating market or social pressures that tend to exacerbate tension among logics (Reay, Goodrick, Waldorff, & Casebeer, 2017). We argue that growing hybridity in highly professionalized workplaces is likely to bring different forms of power into play. Therefore, we investigate the intersection of professional work, hybridity and power to develop a fuller understanding of how tension can be managed in day to day work practices when the actors involved are guided by different institutional logics.

Recent research has given us deeper insights into how organizations respond to institutional complexity through innovative structural approaches and mechanisms aimed at integrating practices governed by different logics (e.g., Lounsbury, 2007; Smets, Morris, & Greenwood, 2012; Zilber, 2002). Surprisingly, even though organizational members are the carriers of institutional logics and enact them in their day to day work, there has so far been little focus on how individuals and groups manage the tensions that arise when logics are combined. To build a more granular understanding of how competing logics held by different

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

groups of actors can be integrated to support day to day work, it is critical to consider the role of power at the micro level. However, the institutional literature in general has tended to shy away from particular attention to power, even though “the relationship between power and institutions is an intimate one” (Lawrence & Buchanan, 2017, p. 477). Those who have incorporated attention to power have tended to keep a relatively macro-level focus (e.g. Lawrence, Winn, & Jennings, 2001; Fligstein & McAdam, 2012) but this higher order level of analysis tends to minimize the importance of actions at the coalface (Barley, 2017) that play out as part of everyday work.

Based on a review of existing work on managing multiple logics in professional settings, we identify different ways in which actors can use their *sources of power* to influence underlying mechanisms for managing the inherent tensions of hybridity. Specifically, we focus on mechanisms underpinning two typical arrangements identified in past research – (1) *hybrid role* as an integrative device underpinning structural differentiation and (2) *socialization practices* that underpin structural blending.

Structural differentiation is especially prevalent in professional settings such as hospitals, legal firms, architecture, and similar professional organizations where the professional and managerial logics reside side by side (Cooper et al., 1996; Reay & Hinings, 2009; Thornton, Jones, & Kury, 2005). Structural blending combines and layers “practices” taken from different logics into a single organization (e.g., Greenwood et al., 2011, p. 352); however, tensions between logics arise in the day to day conduct of professional work (Goodrick & Reay, 2011). Although there are a variety of integrative mechanisms to manage these tensions while also achieving the benefits of internal pluralism (Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Battilana, Sengul, Pache, & Model, 2015; Pache & Santos, 2010), two mechanisms stand out: hybrid roles and socialization practices. However, power lurks in the shadows in these studies and we reveal its influence in this chapter.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

We adopt what some might call a substantialist conception of power that aligns with French and Raven's (1959) classic typology of sources of power. We do this in contrast to a more relational conception of power (e.g. Lukes, 1974) predominantly used by institutional theorists to understand power dynamics at the field level (e.g. Lawrence & Buchanan, 2017). By drawing attention to different sources of power that actors can use as part of their everyday work – reward, coercive, referent, legitimate, and expert power – we highlight what we believe lends itself to a fuller conceptual understanding of how micro level actors manage tensions that arise in a workplace where multiple logics collide. It is through the use of these different types of power that actors develop or modify mechanisms to accomplish work in light of ongoing hybridity. We note that although French and Raven's (1959) sources of power are set out in terms that suggest people or groups “hold” and “use” particular power to accomplish desired outcomes, these bases of power depend on the perceptions and reactions of others. As Buchanan and Badham (2008) explain, an actor “may be able to control rewards and penalties, and have superior knowledge, but if others do not believe that the [actor] possesses these attributes, then they may be unwilling to comply with requests” (p. 48). Therefore, there is a relational aspect to how sources of power are used because the reactions of others are integral to any consequent actions.

In the following sections we first situate our chapter with respect to the growing literature on micro-foundations of institutionalism. We then explain our views on the salience of power in taking a micro-foundations approach to understand different ways of managing tensions among logics in the conduct of day to day work. Following this, we draw on existing studies in professional settings as illustrative cases to draw attention to the role of different types of power as micro level actors navigate conditions of hybridity. Finally, we develop a framework that illuminates how key sources of power based on Buchanan and Badham (2008) and French and Raven (1959) manifest at the level of everyday work practices.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Emerging Approaches to Micro-foundations of Institutional Dynamics

A macro-cultural lens that dominated institutional scholarship until the late 1990s, encapsulated a view of power resonant with ‘repetitively activated, socially constructed controls – that is, by some set of rewards and sanctions’ (Jepperson, 1991, p. 145). As institutional scholarship steered away from enduring organizational structures and practices toward institutional change, the role of agency emerged from the shadows accompanied by a more overt recognition of the politics of institutions and resistance (Lawrence, 2008). Seo and Creed (2002, p. 231) observed that “human agency for institutional change is inseparable from institutional contradictions”. Simultaneously, some scholars made a call to pay attention to the micro-foundations of institutions on the premise that “although institutions penetrate organizations, it is through social interaction that institutions are interpreted and modified as people coordinate the activities that propel institutions forward” (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006, p. 215).

Recent institutional research reflects a decisive shift toward the micro-foundations of how institutions are lived, sustained and altered through the everyday conduct of work by ensembles of individuals on the ground (Powell & Rerup, 2017). Given the predominantly macro-level focus to date, this much needed attention to the micro level not only holds promise to redress the balance, but also to conceptually clarify how the macro-institutional environment links with local micro-level activities, *and vice versa* (Binder, 2007; Smets et al., 2012). Barley and Tolbert’s (1997) imagery of a mutually constitutive relationship between institutions and action foreshadowed a developing notion of microfoundations. Micro-foundations bring into sharp focus what Barley (2017, p. 358) succinctly notes, “everyday life is institutional theory’s coalface; it is where the rubber of theory hits the road of reality”.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Studies in different realms of insitutional theorizing have, albeit implicitly, delved into the micro-foundations of institutions. That institutions provide meaning and are instantiated in day to day interactions and activities has been unequivocally reinforced by a focus on institutional logics. From Friedland and Alford's (1991, p. 243) articulation of logics as "symbolic systems, ways of ordering reality, and thereby rendering experience of time and space meaningful" to Thornton and Ocasio's (2008, p. 112) emphasis on 'rules of the game' for various social domains to *guide behaviours and daily activities* of both organizations and individuals, one thing is clear that logics are made visible through their instantiation in practices, structures and actions on the ground (e.g., Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Lounsbury & Boxenbaum, 2013; McPherson & Sauder, 2013). A growing stream of studies in the realm of practice-driven institutionalism bring micro-foundations into sharp focus (Lounsbury, 2007; Smets et al., 2012). The question that has created common ground for institutional and strategy-as-practice scholars is how the 'rules of the game' materialize in people's everyday praxis (Smets, et al., 2017). An institutionalist approach to practice closes the loop between how practices are anchored in the broader cultural framework on the one hand (Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007) and how everyday work on the ground ratchets up, beyond the organization, to the wider institutional domain (Reay et al., 2013; Smets et al. 2012). This lens provides a helpful conceptual apparatus to understand micro-foundations as not mere micro-level activities occurring in isolation but connected to higher insitutional logics, while at the same time 'individuals' on the ground are carriers and enactors of the logics within organizations (Smets et al., 2017).

McPherson and Sauder (2013) depict a highly agentic picture of the instantiation of logics in their study of how decisions are negotiated in a drug court. Professionals embodying different logics do not stick to their respective logical orientation but creatively 'hijack' logics of others to 'get the work of the court done' (p.165). There is also a flavor of micro-

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

foundations in the theorizing of institutional work which refocuses attention from institutions per se to practices of individual and collective actors aimed at creating, maintaining, and disrupting institutions (Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2011). The resonance between micro-foundations and institutional work emerges from the specific perspective of agency the latter embraces. In contrast to the heroic acts of agency as seen in some of the work on institutional entrepreneurship (Garud, Jain, & Kumaraswamy, 2002; Maguire, Hardy, & Lawrence, 2004) and in some accounts of large-scale institutional transformation (Thornton, 2002), institutional work focuses on ‘myriad day to day instances of agency that although aimed at affecting the institutional order, represent a complex mélange of forms of agency—successful and not, simultaneously radical and conservative...full of compromises, and rife with unintended consequences’ (Lawrence et al., 2011, p. 52). Zietsma and Lawrence (2010) demonstrated how actors engaged in two forms of agency - boundary work and practice work – effected patterns of institutional stability and change in the conflict-ridden field of the British Columbia coastal forest industry. Tracey (2016) unraveled distinct types of micro-level institutional work as types of communication strategies to unpack the micro-foundations of institutional persuasion that convinced individuals to internalize a new institutional logic. In his study of the Alpha course – a movement designed to convert agnostics to an evangelical Christian institutional logic – Tracey (2016) highlighted the strategic use of influence - at the microlevel - typically considered at the field level.

As scholars continue to give attention to the micro-foundations of institutions, the image of ‘logics in action’ begins to bring forward notions of intentionality and effort manifested in institutional work; however, in spite of some attention to agency, there has so far been little consideration of how micro level actors accumulate and use their sources of power. Tracey’s (2016) focus on the strategic use of influence inherently acknowledges the presence of power albeit in more covert ways. As we recognize the promise of these

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

emerging approaches to micro-foundations in the theorizing of different aspects of insitutional dynamics, it is timely to bring to the surface the hidden role of power.

In current work on managing organizational hybridity, power lurks in the background with little insight into how actors with power intervene –by supporting or hampering or altering– the different mechanisms to manage tensions between logics in the conduct of professional work. We now focus on making more explicit the role of power associated with micro-foundations of organizational hybridity.

Power and Managing Tensions Among Logics in Everyday Work

The role of agency and power became increasingly salient in the wave of research focused on organizational hybridity, as a response to institutional complexity, manifested as incompatible prescriptions from multiple institutional logics (Greenwood et al., 2011). In situations of organizational hybridity or conflicting institutional logics, managing the associated tensions is an ongoing concern (Pache & Santos, 2010). Although previous scholars have characterized these tensions as predominantly cognitive, the ways in which actors carrying particular logics use their influence also matters. Put another way, seemingly cognitive mechanisms are underpinned by actors who can use their power within the organization (e.g., Greenwood & Hinings, 1996). As Greenwood et al. (2011) note: “appreciation and recognition of logics, and the choice of which logic to prioritize and how to do so, will be dictated by those with power” (p.345).

Institutions are not inert containers of meaning; rather they are *inhabited by people doing things together* in the context of the organization (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006). Resonant with this perspective is the notion of institutional agency where power is made explicit through the influence of actors on institutional arrangements (Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002; Lawrence, 2008; Maguire et al., 2004). Influence is the ability of one actor

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

to persuade another to do something they would not otherwise do (Clegg, 1989; French & Raven, 1959; Lukes, 1974). Lawrence (2008) notes that there has been a rather narrow focus in terms of forms of power underpinning institutional agency. In a case study of a dispute between student activists and college administrators, Rojas (2010) showed how a College President engaged in institutional work, by leveraging his personal reputation and social connections, to expand his coercive power to sanction the activists. This example highlights the potential use of power by actors attempting to influence organizational and field level change. However, we need more research to further explain how different forms of power can be used in the day to day conduct of work when multiple logics are involved.

French and Raven (1959) set out five power bases (reward, coercive, referent, legitimate and expert) that help to reveal how individuals can convince someone else to do something that he or she would otherwise not do. Buchanan and Badham (2008) developed a modified version of these five power bases by incorporating attention to the relationship and processual aspects of power, as explained by Crozier (1964). As Buchanan and Badham (2008, p. 48) put it, “Power is generated, maintained and lost in the context of relationships with others.” An important implication of this view of power is that each power base is dependent upon the perceptions of others. One further aspect of this approach to power is the important point that sources of power are commonly combined. For example, professionals working in organizations often bring together their sources of expert and legitimate power to gain support from others. In Table 1 we provide a list and description of these five sources of power.

[Table 1 about here]

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Sources of Power and Managing Tensions in the Conduct of Professional Work

One of the mechanisms conspicuous in recent work on managing multiple logics in professional settings is the ‘hybrid role’ that is created to purposefully combine logics in an organizational position that serves as an integrator in the enactment of those logics in day to day professional work. Although the creation of a hybrid role is intended to result in a smooth combining of different logics, we argue that by itself it does not automatically mitigate tensions between the different professional groups or necessarily motivate them to work together harmoniously. Instead, we note that in examples from existing studies, there is underlying evidence that different groups use their power to sometimes support, and sometimes thwart the desired objectives of the hybrid roles. A second mechanism highlighted as an effective means to manage tensions between logics is the use of socialization practices on the ground. This organizational mechanism relies on groups and people working at the front lines finding their own ways to combine logics as part of their day to day work. We next discuss each of these mechanisms in turn and reveal how actors can use their sources of power to affect their enactment.

Hybrid roles

‘Hybrid professionals’ (Blomgren and Waks, 2015) are expected to simultaneously engage with more than one logic – examples include nurse middle managers (Spyridonidis and Currie, 2016), managing partners (Lawrence, Malhotra and Morris, 2012), pharmacists (Goodrick and Reay, 2011) or reinsurance underwriters (Smets et al., 2015). Yet, a closer look reveals that the enactment of such hybrid roles is energized (or challenged) by power lurking in the background in different forms. In a study examining the role of hybrid nurse managers in the implementation of standardized clinical guidelines for care in two NHS teaching hospitals, it is striking that the nurse consultants in the hybrid role were of higher

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

status than the other senior nurses which signalled that the pre-existing legitimate power of nurses was important to the enactment of the role (Spyridonidis and Currie, 2016). Further, these hybrid nurse managers engaged with the professional and managerial logics in ways that enhanced their social position in the eyes of physicians. Put another way, they recognized and responded to the legitimate power and referent power of physicians. In short, the pre-existing status of an actor who assumes a hybrid role in professional settings matters, and its enactment in day to day work can be energized by the use of legitimate and expert power by critical actors in the organization.

In a study of radical transformation in three elite law firms, Lawrence et al., (2012) showed that in the successful case, the enactment of the hybrid role of Managing Partners was energized by the power of reputable senior Partners who engaged in skilful use of language to legitimate routines and practices that influenced the day to day behaviours of actors – professionals and managers. Propelled by this initial momentum, the Managing Partners, assisted by an Executive Committee, were able to use their considerable expert power to enact their hybrid role, independent of the interference of Partners. These actions provided a foundation for implementing key systems that became an integral part of the day to day conduct of professional work.

We can also learn from existing empirical studies in which power was used to *impede* rather than facilitate the enactment of hybrid roles. In an unsuccessful case of attempted transformations in an elite law firm from a traditional professional partnership into a managed professional business, Lawrence et al., (2012) showed that the change toward combining the professional and managerial logics was hampered by an influential Senior Partner who used his legitimate power to stymie the efforts of the Managing Partner and the Executive Committee in performing day to day management functions. Further, while he supported the institution of business functions such as Human Resources, Marketing and

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Finance, he used coercive and expert power to interfere with these systems, using them in an ad hoc manner to support his own aims. Consequently, there was a persistent and unproductive tussle between the professional and management logics in the day to day conduct of work.

In another scenario identified by Spyridonidis and Currie (2016), actors in hybrid roles gravitated toward being guided by one logic over the other (instead of being simultaneously guided by both). This situation arose by the need for approval from powerful actors with legitimate or referent power in the organization. The nurse consultants tended to drift toward the professional logic in their attempt to respond to the legitimate and referent power of physicians. In a similar vein, physician- managers have been shown to privilege professional interests over strategic organizational ones. Notably, they can use their legitimate and expert power to deviate from staying true to the hybrid role. The use of such individual power may be constrained, however, by policy or regulation (McGivern, Currie, Ferlie, Fitzgerald, and Waring, 2015). In another study of radical change in three top Canadian law firms that attempted to incorporate greater managerialism, Malhotra and Hinings (2015) showed that in spite of a designated hybrid role, the Managing Partner pivoted entirely toward the managerial logic by enacting his role through the use of legitimate power in a dictatorial top down fashion. This action was in complete contrast to established norms where the professional logic had traditionally dominated. This culminated in a backlash from Partners expressed as an even stronger opposition to placing non-lawyers in significant positions. As a result, there was a positive turning point when the Partners employed their legitimate power to replace the dictatorial Managing Partner with a consultative one; they also restored some decision making powers to themselves. Overall, these to and fro involving the use of power served to redress the balance of logics in the

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

enactment of the hybrid role, and eventually resulted in innovative solutions to working harmoniously on a day to day basis.

Some studies have focused on a different version of the hybrid role whereby hybridity is embodied by a group of actors holding different logics rather than encapsulated in a single individual. We observe that in such scenarios, actors can use their power in interesting ways to *alter* the impact of the hybrid role. In Battilana and Dorado's (2010) study of micro-finance, one bank used a mix-and-match hiring approach with the intention of creating an integrated group who would be guided by the two logics (professional and managerial) expecting them to work seamlessly together. However, this integration approach resulted in polarization and escalating tensions between the subgroups that were each guided by one of the different logics. Similarly, Almandoz's (2012) mixed results on the likelihood of success of diverse or mixed founding teams to establish local banks at the crossroads of financial and community logics is telling. In a nutshell, the study points to the unpredictability of incorporating mixed motivations and goals on boards and founding teams. Irrespective of the logics they held, founders who were members of the team had legitimate power, which they used in battles that broke out among those with different guiding logics. Therefore, it seems that such variants of the hybrid role were less effective or stable because they were particularly vulnerable to power struggles feeding divisiveness rather than providing focused attention to managing tensions constructively on the ground.

In summary, we argue that when the hybrid role is energized by legitimate or referent power or both, there are better opportunities to enact workplace practices that facilitate fruitful interaction among different groups of actors in day to day to work. Further, it is evident in our illustrations above that the prior status of actors who inhabit hybrid roles means that they hold important legitimate power that can be beneficial in enacting the role. However, we also have evidence of actors taking on hybrid roles when they lack legitimate

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

power. In these instances, we note that unless they can draw on other sources of power (e.g. expert or referent power) their ability to manage the tensions among competing logics is likely significantly compromised.

Socialization practices

In contrast to organizational approaches to hybridity that are based on the creation of a hybrid role to integrate logics, some studies have focused on approaches that rely on individuals and groups at the level of workplace practice to develop their own way to accomplish work by socializing others to manage the tensions. For example, Battilana and Dorado (2010) compared the attempts of two pioneering commercial microfinance organizations to build and sustain two competing logics -- banking and development logics -- and found that the way socialization practices were deployed had a decisive impact on the outcome. In contrast to the sort of hybrid roles discussed above, the successful bank hired inexperienced people with no prior attachment to either the banking or development logics and socialized them to build a shared commitment to both logics in support of the dual social and economic goals. Although not explained in this way by Battilana and Dorado, we noted that this socialization policy stemmed from the experiential knowledge of a German-based development consulting organization IPC, a vital support for the mother NGO. Expert power, therefore, served as the initial trigger for hiring and developing strong networks of individuals who could be moulded and encouraged to blend important aspects of both logics.

Somewhat similarly, Heinze and Weber (2016) examined the process of integrating a new logic of integrative medicine (IM) into strong incumbent organizations (two elite academic medical centres) embedded in the logic of conventional medicine; they illuminated the pivotal role of ‘institutional intrapreneurs’ who were educated in conventional medicine but also certified in IM. Importantly, these institutional intrapreneurs were low to mid-level

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

advocates lacking legitimate power even though they held significant levels of expert power, as evidenced by their high levels of credibility in the wider profession. While they were able to leverage their expert power to garner resources to set up IM programs, they also drew on referent power to develop free spaces that provided opportunities for socialization practices that could draw together diverse groups of professionals. The authors noted that these intrapreneurs crafted a trading zone that served as common ground for mutual learning about how logics could be combined. Thus, the use of referent power facilitated the exchange of knowledge and ideas among IM advocates, alternative medicine practitioners and conventional physicians (p. 164). Rather than using legitimate power to integrate the two logics, we suggest that the use of referent power was essential in ‘opening up’ a safe space for socialization that generated familiarity and respect, which opened the potential for working together. Throughout the initiative, the intrapreneurs were able to draw on their expert power, derived from their knowledge of multiple therapeutic approaches, and combine it with their referent power as evidenced in the employment of their strong social networks across different institutional communities.

In a study of four work integration social enterprises, Ramus, Vaccaro and Brusoni (2017) provided insights into how the interplay between collaboration and formalization mechanisms impacted on resolving tensions between the social and commercial logics in the face of environmental turbulence. Collaboration is a form of socialization process, illustrated in several studies, as a means for actors holding different logics to share information or to create shared solutions for conducting day to day activities (Battilana et al., 2015; Canales, 2014). However, there is evidence to suggest that the role of formalization in the form of written rules and procedures to guide day to day tasks facilitates collaborative efforts (Battilana et al., 2015; Smets et al., 2012). Ramus et al. (2017) showed that in one of the four WISE cases the interplay between collaboration and formalization was most effective in

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

mitigating tensions that arose between the dominant commercial logic and the rising centrality of the social logic. This was because formalization and collaboration were applied sequentially to facilitate daily activities. Carriers of the two logics separately assessed and prioritized practices that really mattered for achieving objectives associated with their respective logics and formalized those practices and objectives. Expert power derived from the formalized procedures created the conditions for the actors guided by the two logics to respect each other's objectives. The rising referent power on both sides boosted collaborative formalization as the actors holding the two logics became more positively inclined to find shared solutions to complex tasks, and thus began to engage in more blended practices.

In a final example, we note that Reay et al. (2017) highlighted the critical role of various types of 'spaces and events' in facilitating change in the professional role identity of family physicians in a study of primary healthcare reform in a Canadian province. These spaces facilitated the bringing together of multiple logics because they were meeting places for physicians, other health professionals, and managers to gather and exchange ideas in groups and one-to-one dyads. These carefully managed socialization processes relied strongly on referent power held by healthcare managers and were vital to the reinterpretation and rearrangement of logics that eventually facilitated a shift in the professional role identity of physicians. Different actors employed different sources of power as they engaged with each other in these spaces of interaction. First, the managers who were key advocates of change compensated for their lack of legitimate power by colluding with renegade physicians (using their referent power) to attract wider physician engagement. Second, they were able to employ reward power by assisting physicians in taking advantage of existing financial incentives. Third, the managers encouraged physicians to employ their expert power by encouraging them to engage in work that "no one else could do", and by separating managerial work as being outside physicians' domain and areas of interest. Collectively, the

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

use of different types of power by different actors facilitated the development of team-based practices that successfully combined multiple logics at the level of everyday practice.

Conclusions

In this chapter we contribute to recent calls for institutional scholars to systematically unpack the micro-foundations of institutional theory. Based on selected examples of studies of organizational hybridity, we reveal some of the ways that actors can use their sources of power to manage the tensions associated with combining logics. We suggest that focusing on the five types of power at the micro level is a good starting point to illuminate ways that integrative mechanisms combine multiple logics in day to day work. In addition, we also draw attention to the possibility that mechanisms themselves affect how the use of power can shape processes of managing tensions among logics at the micro level, as we observed for different variants of the hybrid role. In doing, so we draw attention to an important conceptual building block (power) that is essential to developing a more nuanced theory about the micro-foundations of institutions.

We observe that legitimate, expert and referent power are particularly salient to the conduct of day to day work practices in professional settings. Importantly, we find that the salience of these different sources of power varies depending on the mechanism. Hybrid roles are highly reliant on actors with legitimate power both in terms of their prior status, as well as that vested in them by other critical actors in even higher positions of authority. Put another way, legitimate power is the energy that fuels the enactment of the hybrid role. In addition, actors who hold and use expert power can be critical to the establishment of hybrid roles because they are perceived as knowledgeable in two domains – professional and managerial. On the other hand, we suggest that socialization practices are primarily enabled by a combination of expert power and referent power. Expert power seems to be crucial to facilitating both mechanisms which is not surprising in professional settings where

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

professionals' expert knowledge and skills lie at the core of professional tasks. Professionals accumulate knowledge in the macro-institutional context and bring it into the organization. In this chapter we have focused on how actors can use various sources of power at the micro level where different actors guided by different logics interact. Future research is needed to build on these ideas and show how these actions at the micro-level can generate and support change at the macro-level.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Table 1: How Power Sources can be used to Manage Tension of Multiple Logics

Power Source	Description	Using power to manage tensions among logics	Responding to use of power	Examples
Reward Power	Valued rewards can be offered in return for demonstration of desired behavior	People are rewarded for managing the multiple logics in the desired way.	Others accept reward and follow desired way of managing multiple logics	Reay et al. (2017)
Coercive Power	Penalties or sanctions can be administered in response to lack of desired behavior	People are punished for not managing the multiple logics in the desired way	Others avoid punishment by following desired way of managing multiple logics.	Lawrence et al. (2012)
Referent Power	Personal abilities and personality traits of particular individuals convince others to engage in the desired behaviour	Respected individuals encourage and demonstrate to others how to manage multiple logics	Others agree to adopt new ways based on recommendations and encouragement of respected individuals.	Heinze & Weber (2016); Ramus et al. (2017)
Legitimate Power	Authority position of an individual demands that others engage in the desired behaviour	Individuals in Authority positions demand that others manage multiple logics in the desired way	Others respect the authority of others and follow directions that are given to them.	Almandoz (2012); Spyridonidis & Currie (2016); Lawrence et al. (2012); Malhotra & Hinings (2015); Reay et al. (2017)
Expert Power	Superior knowledge of an individual or group of individuals convinces others to engage in the desired behaviour.	Knowledge experts explain the best way to manage multiple logics and convince others.	Others believe in expertise of select individuals or groups and follow their advice.	Battilana & Dorado (2010); Spyridonidis & Currie (2016); Heinze & Weber (2016); Lawrence et al. (2012); Ramus et al. (2017)

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

References

- Almandoz, J. (2012). Arriving at the starting line: The impact of community and financial logics on new banking ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 1381–1406.
- Barley, S.R. (2017). Coalface institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, and R. E. Meyer (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, pp. 338-364. London: Sage.
- Barley, S. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (1997). Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, 18(1), 93-118.
- Battilana, J. & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, p. 1419-1440.
- Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing—Insights from the study of social enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8, 397–441.
- Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A.-C., & Model, J. (2015). Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: The case of work integration social enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 1658–1685.
- Binder, A. (2007). For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics. *Theory & Society*, 36: 547-571.
- Blomgren, M. & Waks, C. (2015). Coping with contradictions: Hybrid professionals managing institutional complexity. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 2, 78-102.
- Buchanan, D., & Badham, R. (2008). *Power politics and organizational change*. London, UK: Sage.
- Canales, R. (2014). Weaving straw into gold: Managing organizational tensions between standardization and flexibility in microfinance. *Organization Science*, 25, 1–28.
- Cooper, D. J., C. R. Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R. and Brown, J. (1996). Sedimentation and transformation in organizational change: The case of Canadian law firms. *Organization Studies*, 17, 623-647.
- Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of Power*. London: Penguin Books.
- Crozier, M. (1964). *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012). *A theory of fields*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Studies in Social Power*, pp. 15-167. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute of Social Research.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back. In W. W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions*, pp. 232–263. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Garud, R., S. Jain, & A. Kumaraswamy. (2002). Institutional entrepreneurship in the sponsorship of common technological standards: The case of Sun Microsystems and Java. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 196–214.
- Goodrick, E. & Reay, T. (2011). Constellations of institutional logics. *Work and Occupations*, 38, 372-416.
- Greenwood, R. & Hinings, C.R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 1022-1054.
- Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micellota, E., & M. Lounsbury. (2011). Institutional complexity and organizational responses. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 1-55.
- Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 58-80.
- Hallett, T. & Ventresca, M. (2006). Inhabited institutions: Social interactions and institutional forms in Gouldner's patterns of industrial bureaucracy. *Theory and Society*, 35, 213-236.
- Heinze, K. & Weber, K. (2016). Toward organizational pluralism: Institutional pluralism in integrative medicine. *Organization Science*, 27, 157-172.
- Jepperson, R. L. (1991). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. In W. W. Powell & P J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, pp. 143-163. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lawrence, T. B. (2008). 'Power, institutions and organizations'. In Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K. and Suddaby, R. (Eds.), *Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, pp. 170-97. London: Sage.
- Lawrence, T., Malhotra, N., & Morris, T., (2012). Episodic and systemic power in the transformation of professional service firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49, 102–143.
- Lawrence, T. & Buchanan, S. (2017). Power, institutions and organizations. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, and R. E. Meyer (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, pp. 477-506. London: Sage.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

- Lawrence, T. B., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1), 52-58.
- Lawrence, T. B., Winn, M., & Jennings, P. D. (2001). The temporal dynamics of institutionalization. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 624-644.
- Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 289–307.
- Lounsbury, M., & Boxenbaum, E. (Eds.). (2013). *Institutional logics in action*. (Vol. 39A/B). Bingley: Emerald.
- Lounsbury, M., & Crumley, E. T. (2007). New practice creation: An institutional perspective on innovation. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 993-1012.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. London: MacMillan.
- Malhotra, N. & Hinings, C.R. (2015). Unpacking continuity and change as a process of organizational transformation. *Long Range Planning*, 48, 1-22.
- Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 657-679.
- McGivern, G., Currie, G., Ferlie, E., Fitzgerald, L. & Waring, J. (2015). Hybrid manager-professionals' identity work: The maintenance and hybridization of medical professionalism in managerial contexts. *Public Administration*, 93, 412-432.
- McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. (2013). Logics in action: Managing institutional complexity in a drug court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(2), 165-196.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Pache, A.C & Santos, F. (2010). When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 455–476.
- Powell, W. W., & Colyvas, J. A. (2008). Micro-foundations of institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*, pp. 276–298. London: Sage.
- Powell, W. W. & Rerup, C. (2017). Opening the black box: The micro-foundations of institutions. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, and R. E. Meyer (Eds.), *The sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, pp. 311-337. London: Sage.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

- Ramus, T., Vaccaro, A., & Brusoni, S. (2017). Institutional complexity in turbulent times: Formalization, collaboration, and the emergence of blended logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 1253-1284.
- Reay, T., Chreim, S., Golden-Biddle, K., Goodrick, E., Williams, B. E., Casebeer, A., Pablo, A., & Hinings, C. R. (2013). Transforming new ideas into practice: An activity based perspective on the institutionalization of practices. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(6), 963-990.
- Reay, T., Golden-Biddle, K., & Germann, K. (2006). Legitimizing a new role: Smallwins and microprocesses of change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(5), 977-998.
- Reay, T., Goodrick, B., Waldorff, S., Casebeer, A. (2017). Getting leopards to change heir spots Co-creating a new professional role identity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 1043-1070
- Reay, T. & C. R. Hinings, C.R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization Studies*, 30, 629-652.
- Rojas, F. (2010). Power through institutional work: Acquiring academic authority in the 1968 third world strike. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1263-1280
- Seo, M. G. & Creed, W. E. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 222-247.
- Smets, M., Aristidou, A., & Whittington, R. (2017). Towards a practice-driven institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. B. Lawrence, & R. Meyer (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism, 2nd ed.*, pp. 384-411. London: Sage.
- Smets, M., Morris, T. & Greenwood, R. (2012). From practice to field: A multilevel model of practice-driven institutional change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55, 877-904.
- Smets, M., Jarzabkowski, P., Burke, G.T. & Spee. P. (2015). Reinsurance trading in lloyd's of London: Balancing conflicting-yet-complementary logics in practice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 932-970.
- Spyridonidis, D. & Currie, G. (2016). The translational role of hybrid nurse middle managers in implementing clinical guidelines: Effect of, and upon, professional and managerial hierarchies. *British Journal of Management*, 27, 760-777.
- Thornton, P. H. (2002). The rise of the corporation in a craft industry: Conflict and conformity in institutional logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 81-101.
- Thornton, P. H., Jones, C., & Kury, K. (2005). Institutional logics and institutional change in organizations: Transformation in accounting, architecture, and publishing. In M. Lounsbury (Ed.), *Transformation in cultural industries*, pp. 125-170. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publication industry, 1958–1990. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 801–843.

Hybridity and Power in the Micro-foundations of Professional Work

Thornton, P. H. & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin-Andersen, and R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, pp. 99-129. London: Sage.

Tracey, P. (2016). Spreading the word: The Microfoundations of institutional persuasion and conversion. *Organization Science*, 27(4), 989-1009.

Zietsma, C. & Lawrence, T.B. (2010). Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field: The interplay of boundary work and practice work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 189-221.

Zilber, T. B. (2002). Institutionalization as an interplay between actions, meanings, and actors: The case of a rape crisis center in Israel. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 234–254.