

Hybrid organizing in complex and turbulent fields:

Liberté, Egalité... Ambition?

Rivière, Anne - Boitier, Marie- Khlif, Wafa

TBS Business School

a.riviere@tbs-education.fr

Résumé :

Le comportement des organisations hybrides a récemment fait l'objet d'une abondante littérature académique. Cependant, la manière dont ces organisations hybrides émergent et gagnent progressivement de l'influence sur un champ institutionnel complexe et turbulent est rarement mise en évidence. L'objectif de cet article est d'explorer cette question.

La complexité institutionnelle (Greenwood et al., 2011) est engendrée par la coexistence potentiellement conflictuelle de plusieurs logiques institutionnelles auxquelles les acteurs vont se référer (Friedland et Alford, 1991 ; Thornton et al., 2012). La littérature suggère que cette complexité institutionnelle génère à la fois des tensions parfois délétères (Besharov et Smith, 2014) et des opportunités pour les organisations hybrides. Dans cet article, nous envisageons l'hybridité comme « le mélange entre des éléments organisationnels centraux n'allant habituellement pas de pair » (Battilana et al., 2017). Nous analysons ainsi l'hybridité en termes de formes organisationnelles et de logiques institutionnelles, ainsi que les tensions qu'elle génère. La gestion de ces tensions est d'autant plus complexe et difficile que le champ institutionnel est agité de turbulences économiques et/ou sociales (Reay et Hinings, 2009 ; Ramus et al., 2017).

Notre recherche s'appuie sur une étude de cas longitudinale d'une organisation hybride créée au moment des émeutes des banlieues françaises de 2005. Elle se développe dans le champ de l'égalité des chances. Cette organisation vise à contribuer à l'inclusion sociale en s'occupant initialement de favoriser l'accès à l'enseignement supérieur de jeunes des quartiers défavorisés. Mais l'égalité des chances peut être interprétée de manière différente selon que les acteurs se réfèrent à une logique sociale, à une logique de marché ou à celle de l'État. Nos résultats montrent que cela génère des tensions organisationnelles sur les objectifs poursuivis. Ils montrent également que, malgré ces tensions, les turbulences de ce champ traversé par des inégalités sociales parfois violentes procurent des opportunités de développement à l'hybride étudié. Pour devenir un acteur majeur du champ, l'hybride évolue dans sa forme et se développe. Il fusionne stratégiquement avec une organisation concurrente et devient ainsi principal acteur de ce champ, au centre d'un réseau de parties prenantes mixant acteurs publics et privés. Ce faisant, il reproduit en partie les tensions d'un champ fragmenté qui voit coexister des acteurs publics, privés et sociaux, et dans lequel l'Etat est paradoxalement porteur d'une logique de marché au détriment de la logique sociale d'inclusion.

Mots-clés : hybride, logique institutionnelle, égalité des chances, complexité institutionnelle, études critiques en management

Hybrid organizing in complex and turbulent fields:

Liberté, Egalité... Ambition?

Over the past decades, organizations have increasingly transcended boundaries between for-profit, non-profit and public sectors in many areas. Hybrid organizations are thus gaining prevalence in modern societies (Kraatz et Block, 2008; Pache et Santos, 2013; Besharov et Smith, 2014; Smith et Besharov, 2017). Summarizing the perspectives of current research on hybrids, Battilana et al. (2017) give a broad definition of hybridity as “the mixing of core organizational elements that would not conventionally go together” (p.129). Hybrids manage challenges and opportunities through strategies that tend to either integrate or differentiate their multiple identities, forms or logics in blended or structural hybrids.

Recent researches on hybrid organizations have focused on social enterprises combining aspects of business and of charity forms at their core (Jay, 2013; Pache et Santos, 2013; Ramus et al., 2017). This literature suggests that managing tensions between competing logics is particularly challenging in situations of environmental turbulence (Reay et Hinings, 2009; Ramus et al., 2017), that may undermine hybrids’ ability to implement coherent strategies. Although recent literature on hybrids has been flourishing, the question of how organizational hybridization reflects tensions between competing institutional logics in an emerging turbulent field remains under-researched.

In this paper, we seek to address this question. We do so by analyzing the case of a hybrid organization arising and flourishing in an original empirical context: the field of equal opportunities in France. The initial mission of the organization, hereafter called *Passport*, was to encourage young people from deprived Parisian areas to engage in higher education studies. Through a hybrid organizational form, *Passport* started to organize mentoring actions between high school students and telecom companies willing to implement human resources policies favoring social diversity. Whereas in many countries, equal opportunities would rather refer to gender inequality, it has in France a strong social reference. The concept of equal opportunities in the French context expresses a socio-political will in reducing social inequalities, especially for young people. It may be controversial, so actors may interpret it in several ways, congruent

with different competing institutional logics (Friedland et Alford, 1991; Thornton et al., 2012). It may refer to various aims, practices, norms, and values, embedded either in a market logic, a state logic or a social logic (Pache et Santos, 2013; Ramus et al., 2017). These three coexisting and sometimes conflicting institutional logics create institutional complexity (Greenwood et al., 2011; Besharov et Smith, 2014) in the field of equal opportunities, torn between social turmoil and social innovation. As in other countries, corporations increasingly engage in social-related activities, and non-profit organizations engage in commercial activities (Battilana et Lee, 2014). But in the French context, the combination of the state's key role in the pursuit of the general interest and a traditional suspicion towards private philanthropy (Chelle, 2017) amplifies the institutional complexity of the equal opportunities' field. In the last 15 years, the French state spawned new laws and/or partnerships trying to respond to the sometimes-violent social demands of the deprived suburban youth. Literature suggests that managing tensions is challenging for hybrids in such situations of environmental turbulence (Reay et Hinings, 2009; Ramus et al., 2017), where emotions are at stake (Toubiana et Zietsma, 2017). We argue that it also opens opportunities for hybrid organizations acting strategically to become visible in the field and influence thus the dynamics of the field.

The study is novel, first, by explaining how turbulence can be an opportunity for hybrid organizations facing institutional complexity. They are offered to develop strategic social positioning and to influence thus social transformation. Second, the study contributes to extend theories on hybrid organizing in a context where the state's influence is central but is paradoxically at the same time centralized and fragmented. It responds thus to Battilana et al. (2017) call for examining how and to what extent organizations engage in various forms of hybrid organizing in relation with their institutional environment.

We structure our arguments as follows. First, we review the literature on hybrids, and discuss the consequences of institutional complexity specifically for the field of equal opportunities. Second, we explain our methodology and introduce the case study (*Passport*) and its context. Third, we present the findings on the transformations of *Passport*, from emergence to leadership in the field. We conclude with a discussion and contributions.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this paper, we approach organizational hybridity as “the mixing of core organizational elements that would not conventionally go together” (Battilana et al., 2017:129). This allows us to consider hybridity according to two complementary perspectives: organizational hybrid forms and hybrids as a combination of logics.

1.1 ORGANIZATIONAL HYBRID FORMS

One first way to analyze hybridity is to focus on the combination of organizational features related to their governance structures. For most of the twentieth century, commercial businesses, state organizations and private charities forms were exclusively associated with the private, public, and non-profit sectors, respectively. Over the last three decades however, the boundaries between these forms and their associated sectors have become increasingly blurred (Battilana et Lee, 2014). Non-profit organizations (NPOs) have developed notably a growing role in public service provision and are often contracted to public sector commissioners, which in turn shape them similarly to “firms”. This on-going process generates various organizational hybrid forms, including public-private partnerships or social enterprises (Jay, 2013).

In this perspective, each organizational form consists of a specific cluster of features. Institutionalized forms acquire legitimacy, getting access to unique resource niches and benefiting from regulations, which gives them the greatest likelihood of survival (Battilana et Lee, 2014). Hybrids arise when countervailing mechanisms lead organizations to combine multiple forms, arising from external changes or from alertness for new opportunities. In the process of transformation, boundaries of hybrid organizations may fade, especially within the third sector where individuals contributing to the organization can be either volunteers, employees, or former beneficiaries.

Based on Powell’s idea of “neither market nor hierarchy” (1990), hybrid organizations are then described as networked organizational forms. Accordingly, hybridity entails specific governance, financing and control relations through networks and inter-organizational relationships. Because hybridity is a multi-level phenomenon, it is perceived as embedded simultaneously in individuals, in groups, in organizations and in broad networks (Denis et al., 2015: 281).

The hybrid organizations’ innovativeness poses thus unique challenges to their sustainability (Battilana et Lee, 2014). The enclosed multiple forms of interactions create internal and external

tensions, which express also the combination of multiple societal rationales, or institutional logics inside hybrids.

1.2 INSTITUTIONAL COMPLEXITY AND HYBRIDITY OF LOGICS

Institutional logics are defined as “socially constructed, historical patterns of cultural symbols and material practices, assumptions, values and beliefs” (Thornton et al., 2012: 51). Beyond the cognitive dimensions, people can feel emotionally committed to a logic and its enactment (Pache et Santos, 2013; Toubiana et Zietsma, 2017). Field-level mechanisms play a key role in the filtering, framing and enforcing of logics in organizations. Consequently, attempts to understand complexity at the organizational level necessarily encompass field-level processes (Greenwood et al., 2011). Logics shape acceptable goals and principles within a field, thus influencing organizations’ priorities (Pache et Santos, 2013), and practices (Battilana et al., 2017). Both organizations’ priorities and practices make evident the features of institutional logics as they link organizational action to institutional fields (Glynn et Raffaelli, 2013).

A growing stream of research emphasizes the consequences for organizations of institutional complexity resulting from multiple contradicting institutional demands (Kraatz et Block, 2008; Greenwood et al., 2011; Pache et Santos 2013; Ramus et al., 2017). Institutional complexity is not dealt with similarly by all organizations but opens opportunities for creative responses by combining different cultural symbols and material practices provided by the logics (Besharov et Smith, 2014). Moreover, institutional complexity is not only the result of the incompatibility of two logics, since interactions with other logics are often also in play (Greenwood et al., 2011). Commitments to multiple logics can increase organizational legitimacy and access to resources from external constituencies - including the state - who hold competing expectations. Institutional complexity entails an extended institutional infrastructure of field-level intermediaries to whom organizations can connect (Kodeih et Greenwood, 2014). If sustained over time, hybridity offers thus potential opportunities for organizations (Smith and Besharov, 2017). Finally, tensions between various elements of hybridization can also fuel creative solutions to organizational or societal challenges and bring forth social innovations (Jay, 2013). Hybrids may thus foster innovative practices, in which material elements can play different roles related to different logics, while remaining materially unchanged. Some of these emergent organizational practices may then radiate to the field-level (Smets et al., 2012).

As the influence of hybrid organizations on their turbulent field has been little investigated in existing studies, we believe there is a need to explore how hybrids emerge in complex institutional environments and progressively gain influence on a turbulent field. Literature suggests that hybrids may adapt to changing institutional environments and in return influence some of the practices of their field (Battilina et al., 2017). However, few studies analyze how situations of environmental turbulence (Reay et Hinings, 2009; Ramus et al., 2017) may create not only additional challenges, but also opportunities for strategic hybrids to grow and strive to be a key influence in their field.

1.3 FROM THE ABSTRACT EQUALITY TO THE POLYSEMOUS EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

Ocasio et al. (2016) underline that societal logics are not static ideal types but are also crafted from history. Principles and practices of any given societal logic reflect a particular historical moment. Likewise, the concept of equality was molded along time by historical and political contexts. So, it is important to understand how the polysemous concept of equal opportunities became in France a demonstration of the abstract principle of equality, compatible with changing societal logics.

The principle of equality lies at the foundation of the legal order and the social contract. It is inherently ambivalent, crossing the common good with individual interests (Barles, 2001). Understanding how these two interests combine can lead to discerning the political environment in which they develop. On one hand, the liberal approach considers the spontaneous harmonization of individual and general interests through market mechanisms, fitting with a societal market logic. On the other hand, the interventionist approach presents the state as the safe guardian of the general interest, subordinating production, distribution and consumption to the best interests of society, more consistent with a societal state logic. Among those who value individual rights and those who give the state the monopoly of its definition, the notion of general interest is the cornerstone of the legitimacy of public action (Bouchard et al., 2001). However, these two approaches proved their inability in responding to the complexity of the new social issues, leading to a new paradigm of governance. This involves a new social architecture that mobilizes the state, the market and civil society (Jenson, 2004).

This debate puts forward the question of the practicability of the concept of equality. Along time, the legal concept of “equality by nature” had to develop in relative terms to deliver solutions to the positioned citizens within their physical, social and economic determinations and potential discriminations (Bénéton, 1990). Equality is used to reformulate differences in a

“just” environment, reframing the concept within political considerations. In France, this concept echoes profound socio-historical roots related to the social contract¹ of Rousseau and the central egalitarianism of the Jacobin². The French motto “*Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*” laid on the pediment of all public schools, shows how equality is deeply intertwined with the values of liberty and fraternity. It reflects the unity of the people and the indivisibility of the Republic. This indivisibility opposes strongly the recognition of any minority or community. The equality in rights and duties, an equality before the law and the instruction, is the very condition of modern democratic societies. However, in the French democratic practice, this individual equality concerns only the public life sphere, as cultural or religious particularities are devolved to the private life sphere (Schnapper, 1987). Since the 1789 revolution, the French republic elevated the general interest represented by the democratic state and was hostile to partial interests represented by any form of association, even religious (Archambault, 2015). Both the 1901 law (legal status of associations) and the 1905 law (church and state separation), which remained unchanged, corroborated the key importance of the notion of “*laïcité*” (laicism) in the French republican ideal, which is still vivid nowadays.

However, in 1940, General Petain in his dictatorial regime presented the “equality by nature” as a “false idea” and introduced the “imperative idea” of “equal opportunities” as an opportunity given to all French citizens to “prove their aptitude to serve”³. Despite its embarrassing origin, the concept of “equal opportunities” tends since then to replace the republican French egalitarian ideal by reconciling individualism and pluralism (Barles, 2001). It is presented as the expression of social cohesion, used notably in the political discourse for education, even though inequalities of the French education system have been denounced. Several scholars agreed that social reproduction outweighs largely social mobility since the 1960s (Terrail, 2002), and that school does not reduce globally social inequalities. Koubi and Guglielmi (2000) argue that politicians and legislators hide the real question of the development of economic and social inequalities in using the “indeterminate” notion of equal opportunities that poses inequalities as politically unavoidable. This vision also questions the idea of social justice that

¹ This social pact establishes that everyone must give up all his or her special rights or the strongest to obtain the equality of rights that society provides: In *Le contrat social* by J.J Rousseau, 1762.

² The most influential network during the French revolution, promoting notably egalitarianism (1789-1794).

³ Speech of the General Pétain of October 11, 1940. In the same speech, the Marxist concept of “class struggle” is denounced, replaced by the promotion of “true elites” in a corporatist vision of society.

has been developed in France since the 19th century, where the solidarity guaranteed by the state is central (Supiot, 2019). Therefore, equal opportunities tend to be dominated by an elitist tropism, based on individual meritocracy. Nonetheless, another model exists “not so much about equal opportunities as it is about social equalization” (Dubet, 2010).

Despite this debate, equal opportunities became an objective in multiple policies of successive French governments for education and urban development. Some of these policies lack operational content, notably on ethno-racial discriminations (Simon, 2015). In the French institutional context, ethnic origin is an unacceptable criterion for social classification, complicating the implementation of policies to fight racial discriminations. But turbulences following the various violent episodes in different deprived suburbs attracted attention on social inequalities for young people mainly originating from immigration, even structurally ancient.

The malleable and polysemous concept of equal opportunities carries therefore the seeds for several interpretations, embedded in competing institutional logics (Friedland et Alford, 1991; Thornton et al., 2012). Some actors might insist on a vision of “egalitarian liberalism”, emphasizing “liberty” in the French motto. Equal opportunities mean then promoting role models of some successful individuals to access to the labor market and reach higher positions, according to a market logic. Other actors might have a more collective conception of society, where equal opportunities are meant to improve solidarity, in a social logic emphasizing more fraternity. However, the state logic requires regulation to fight discriminations, embracing equality according to a legal vision.

Hence, hybrid organizations can emerge in such complex institutional environments, where three competing institutional logics (market, social and state) are shaping the emerging field of equal opportunities in France. The hybrid can gain influence and leadership within this field by wittingly navigating and combining the different institutional logics.

2. METHODS

2.1 RESEARCH CONTEXT AND DESIGN

To answer our research question, we engaged in an inductive study of the institutional field of equal opportunities in France and of a specific hybrid organization, *Passport*, that emerged in the context of acute social tensions. *Passport* started as a mentoring program for high school pupils of deprived areas around Paris, to encourage them to gain higher education qualifications. It was also intended to fit the needs of telecom companies willing to favour social

diversity in their recruitment. This public-private partnership soon transformed into an NPO, flourished through multiple interactions in the emergent turbulent field of equal opportunities. Qualitative case studies are an appropriate methodological approach to explore the research question of how organizations deal with environmental and internal factors that affect their development over time (Eisenhardt, 1989). Besides, single cases constitute a particularly powerful way of researching phenomena about which relatively little is known, with a focus on rich contextual detail (Langley, 1999). We undertook a longitudinal case study (2005-2018) and adopted prescribed analytical techniques to move from raw data to theoretical interpretations, iterating among data collection, analysis, and existing literature related to the field to generate insights (Langley, 1999).

So, we first developed a rich case study that integrated various sources of data. The case includes a timeline of events both in the field of equal opportunities in France and directly related to the hybrid organization hereafter called *Passport*. *Passport* was created in 2005 as a public-private partnership contributing actively to the field ever since. We then analysed several stakeholders, including partner corporations, other rival NPOs, and representatives of public organizations. We finally conducted a deep description of how events unfolded over time (Langley, 1999), so that to understand the different dynamics and logics (market, state and social) interacting within the field during the period of observation.

At the field-level, *Passport* appears as a strategic actor, actively striving to get increasing public and private support from various stakeholders. The evolving organizational hybrid form of *Passport* supports the NPO in getting more symbolic, economic and financial resources and legitimacy in this turbulent field. The story leveraged in 2017, when *Passport* announced its merger with its main rival NPO. With the motto “seize power over the future”, the new merged entity - hereafter referred to as *A1* - increases ambitions to continue its growth.

2.2 DATA SOURCES

We collected data using semi-structured interviews, keyword searches of newspapers articles and websites of competing NPOs, and a wide variety of documents, as summarized in table 1. Documents comprise archival data, press accounts, official legal documentation, web and internal publications detailing the missions and actions of *Passport* and *A1*.

Key actors' semi-structured interviews were conducted with 30 individuals, all of whom were involved, connected to, or well-informed of the development of *Passport*. Informants included *Passport* and *A1* representatives, former mentees of *Passport* still involved as “ambassadors”

of the NPO, students currently mentored by *AI*, representatives of public organizations in charge of equal opportunities programs, and of private partners of *Passport*.

The interviews took place in three rounds: we conducted the first interviews in March 2017, and started collecting then archival data, mainly focused on *Passport*. We conducted the second round from February to June 2018, before the merger was implemented operationally. The third round happened after the completion of the merged structure *AI* in October-November 2018, with representatives of *AI* who were either originally members of the former rival NPO or of *Passport*, in their new shared offices. During this last round, we also had the opportunity to have informal conversations with *AI* employees and volunteers, and to observe social interactions between them during coffee and lunch breaks. These informal comments and interview observations such as nonverbal clues were documented in our research diary. The 33 interviews, with 30 individuals, were recorded and transcribed, with a total duration of 40 hours. We mainly met representatives with a long involvement in one of the founding members of *AI*, knowledgeable of their respective history and with managing positions within *AI*, and some newcomers.

Table 1: Data sources

Data source	Type of actor/ organization	Number
Semi-structured interviews: 33 30 minutes to 2 hours 30 face to face 3 by phone	Students mentored by <i>Passport/AI</i>	4
	Former mentees/ ambassadors of <i>Passport/AI</i>	3
	Representatives of <i>Passport/AI</i>	18
	Representatives of public organizations	6
	Representatives of corporations, partners of <i>AI</i>	2
Newspapers	National press articles on <i>Passport</i> (2012-2017) and <i>AI</i> (2017/2018)	140
External documents	Legal Reports (Cour des comptes, Borloo report, Haut Conseil Vie Associative...)	12
	Reports and documents from consulting firms and think tanks on impact and equal opportunities	23
Internal documents	Documents from <i>Passport</i> website (reports, detailed programs)	30
Illustrative websites consulted	Official websites of the ministry of education, urban policy, social cohesion (summaries of laws and public programs)	5
	Websites of rival NPOs in the field	10
Other archival data	Data on <i>Passport</i> and <i>AI</i> board members and partners	-
	Videos of <i>Passport</i> and <i>AI</i> promoting their programs	20

Overall, the interview data enabled us mainly to build an understanding of how *Passport* was created, how it developed and merged into *AI*. Actors evoked the current structure of *AI* and expressed their feelings regarding the current and future challenges they faced.

In addition, we extracted data from *Passport* and *AI* websites at different dates throughout our analysis, to build a data base independently from the various changes affecting the organization, and triangulate facts (Eisenhardt, 1989) about *Passport*'s programs and partnerships. We also collected archival data dating back to 2005 at the field level, including 140 media articles on *Passport* and *AI*, numerous publications and official reports on equal opportunities policies. Finally, we also used web-based accounts of organizational identity and missions both for *Passport* and for other NPOs in the field. Web-based accounts constitute a distinctive genre of collective identity particularly interesting because they are "official" and provide access to elements that organizations use to present themselves to specific audiences (Sillince et Brown, 2009). The archival data enabled us to develop an understanding of 1/ the institutional context within which *Passport* operated, 2/ the dynamics of the three competing logics in the field, and 3/ *Passport* interactions with the field-level actors.

2.3 DATA ANALYSIS

The first phase of our data analysis was consistent with a "narrative strategy", which involves construction of a detailed story from the raw data (Langley, 1999: 695). In addition to the detailed events historical timeline, we integrated data sources to achieve a high degree of authenticity, combining interviews, archival data and other secondary data sources.

As we aim at understanding the process of hybrid organizing in relation to a complex institutional environment, we have developed this analysis both to understand the evolution of the field and the dynamics of *Passport*'s transformation, from 2005 (creation) until 2018 (merger). So, we built up both a timeline of events at the field level and at the organizational level (Table 3), in order to unfold the process of change (Langley, 1999) and the interactions between *Passport* and its field.

Building on the macro-social ideal types of Thornton et al. (2012) and Pache et Santos (2013), we also characterized the co-existing market, social, and state logics competing in this field (Table 2) through discourses, practices and representations of the different actors at play. We used then this table to code our data to analyse the elements of the combined logics in each step of change. Our analysis focuses on the interactions between the hybrid organization and its evolving complex field. As a result, we analyze how conflicting logics of the field create organizational hybridity, which in turn, influences the field's hybridity.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 THREE COMPETING LOGICS WITHIN THE FIELD OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

The field of equal opportunities in France is complex because of three main reasons. The first one relates to the ambiguity of the concept of equal opportunities in the French context, as discussed in the theory section, rooted in the complete reconsideration of the concept of equality, which is strongly connected to the notion of laicism. The second reason reveals the multiple and non-coordinated actors who would shape the concept of equal opportunities according to their own aims, norms and related practices, embedded in conflicting institutional logics (Friedland et Alford, 1991, Thornton et al., 2012). The third reason stems from the social turbulences expressed within the field. During the period of observation, France was the arena of debates about equality, of episodes of emotions connected with laicism, and of social violence provoking changes.

As explained above, we characterized the three co-existing market, social, and state logics competing in this field (see Table 2) through discourses and representations of the different actors at play. Field-level logics, nested in far-reaching societal logics, tend to emerge from the shared experiences and histories of interconnected groups of actors (Ocasio et al., 2016). Since in the French democracy religious and cultural particularities are confined to the private sphere, the religious and family logics are not expressed at the field level, although individual actors may refer to them. So, these three logics were the main logics active in this field.

Table 2: Competing logics within the field of equal opportunities

	Social logic	State logic	Market logic
Perspective of equal opportunity	Addressing social needs: Remedying social disparities	Defining redistribution mechanisms and regulating against discriminations	Facilitating access to labor market to socially diverse profiles
Legitimate organizational form	NPO: association (French 1901 law)	Public bodies and bureaucracy	For profit corporations
Aims	Altruism, philanthropy	Public interest	Private interest/profit
Values	Solidarity	Equality	Competition
Practices	School support, cultural openness, social commitment in local communities	Priority areas defined centrally (maps) Specific budget allocation for education and cohesion	HR and CSR policies (skills-based sponsorship) Mentoring
Governance mechanism	Democratic control	Bureaucratic control	Hierarchical control
Goal	Education for every citizen	Social cohesion	Social legitimacy
Basis of attention	Group	The nation state	Individual

The field of equal opportunities is both complex and highly fragmented (Greenwood et al., 2011). It is also facing turbulences, particularly in education, since violent episodes in the suburbs in 2005 put under the spot social inequalities for young people mainly originating from immigration, even ancient. These turbulences create both tensions and opportunities for hybrid organizations to gain bigger influence in this unstable and fragmented field.

3.2 A TRANSFORMATIVE HYBRID FORM FLOURISHING IN AN UNSTABLE FIELD

From the outset, *Passport* has a hybrid organizational form. With regards to the logics at play, the goal of *Passport* is inscribed in a social logic. But its founder, a former manager in charge of diversity programs of a telecom company, runs *Passport* with governance practices embedded in a market logic. Table 3 presents a condensed timeline of events from the creation of *Passport* to the development of a new merged hybrid hereafter called *A1*.

Table 3: Timeline of events

	Year	Events
Creation and professionalization	2005	Creation of <i>Passport</i> telecom engineer: public-private contractual partnership between one telecommunication company and two ministries (Education and employment)
	2006	New name and legal form : shift to an NPO (association 1901 law) . The association is called <i>Circle Passport Promotion Telecom</i> , with a 3 year-memorandum signed by 6 private telecom companies and 5 ministries, mainly focused on mentoring young people from sensitive urban areas
	2008	Name of the association is changed to: <i>Circle Passport Telecom (CPT)</i>
	2009	Independence and professionalization of <i>CPT</i> : moving into new headquarters, hiring new support staff. <i>CPT</i> is still chaired by the CEO of the founding telecom company, and the memorandum of understanding is renewed. Revenues of <i>CPT</i> have quintupled between 2005 and 2009; 500 mentees/ year
Expansion	2010	Expansion : New name for the association: <i>Passport</i> , enabling the recruitment of new partners outside the telecom sector. The new president is the CEO of the biggest French telecom company. New major private industrial and consulting partners join <i>Passport</i> , helping to develop national programs and to start digital platforms and Moocs (significant pro bono work and funding).
	2012	<i>Passport</i> issues its first SROI report (with significant pro bono work of Consulting 1)
	2013	Official support of the State to <i>Passport's</i> actions: enactment of an inter-ministerial agreement
	2014	Recognition of <i>Passport</i> as a public interest organization (tax advantages for funding and access to public subsidies). Revenues of <i>Passport</i> continue to grow (gone up one and a half time compared to 2010); 1 000 mentees/ year
Public legitimization	2015	Labeling <i>Passport</i> with « la France s'engage »: recognition as an organization of social utility with a substantial amount of public-private funding, allowing to hire highly qualified professional managers. The president of Consulting 1 becomes president of <i>Passport</i> .
	2016	<i>Passport</i> is 1 of the 4 projects selected in the first call for projects financed by a social impact contract
	2017	Announcement of the merger with a rival NPO into a new (hybrid) association: <i>A1</i> Financial statements of both NPOs show equivalent amounts of subsidies (<i>Passport's</i> revenues have more than doubled compared to 2014), with respectively 30 and 40 employees; 6 000 mentees/year each
Merged leader	2018	The digital platform “Inspire” for orientation is labeled by the Ministry of education <i>A1</i> is 1 of the 22 projects selected for the French Impact tender, for social and solidarity economy <i>A1</i> moves to a new building at the Bastille (symbolic square for the French republic) called “the ladder” The two co-presidents of <i>A1</i> belong to major international consulting firms.

Step by step, *Passport* has transformed into a new hybrid form *AI*, simultaneously sketches out the equal opportunities field incorporating greater hybridity of logics. *Therefore, the NPO* becomes a front-line player influencing the field.

3.2.1 Creation. The founder of the future NPO initially gave impetus to a public-private partnership between a telecom company and two ministries, that aimed at:

encouraging access to public telecom engineering schools for pupils of high schools located in deprived areas and finding the necessary skills in line with constantly changing industry needs (memorandum of understanding – March 2005)

Passport was born from the idea to recruit young people “socially diverse”, but to succeed they needed to have training levels matching with our business. (...) In the first initiatives favoring diversity, the mechanics was: “the school speaks to the school”, working on obstacles like academic support, selection processes... This path is surely important, but I felt it was not enough, because teachers will experience barriers that they will not be able to overcome alone. Typically: what is life after school? How do you explain that to young people when you are a teacher, and you don’t have yourself a clear vision of what is life after school, especially life in a company! (...) I was lucky to have a visionary CEO who said: I am in! So, everybody agreed, that’s how it works! He really played the game (founder 1).

The telecom company was involved in mentoring actions for the selected pupils, to “give (them) the keys to build an ambitious career path” and teach them “corporate codes” (*Passport* website). The ministry of Education opened the doors of the public high schools in priority education areas to *Passport* but did not fund it. A year after, *Passport* was converted into an NPO, namely an association:

After one year of success, I had to convince my boss that we would gain in setting up a pool of companies to join us, that we would have more impact and gain in being recognized as a pioneer company. Around the table, we had two types of actors: some companies came because of their CEO’s personal beliefs, and others arrived more obliged, because my boss wrote to the CEOs of our main suppliers “I am deeply committed to this project”, so it was a bit complicated for them to say no! At the first meeting, there was some coldness with these people (*laughs*) but the nice thing is that they all stayed with us. Some of them are real strong supporters (founder 1).

In 2009, *Passport* moved from the premises of its originate telecommunication company into new separate headquarters, and started hiring its own staff.

3.2.2 Enlarging private and public partners network. Between 2010 and 2015, *Passport* grew as an organization. The name of the association changed, and new partners joined the NPO, notably large consulting firms *Consulting1*⁴ & 2, for CSR mentoring programs. Besides mentoring, *Consulting1* provides also free consulting services (pro bono work) to help the consolidation of *Passport* (regional development strategy, SROI study) and the creation and

⁴ *Consulting1* is a global professional services company (strategy, consulting, digital and technology services). The French CEO is a very active executive member of the Medef (employers' organization), promoting social footprint of companies in a liberal way, on a voluntary basis without legal constraint. He is regularly present in *Passport* events as the president of the strategic council of *Passport*, and currently *AI* co-president.

implementation of a first digital platform (with e-learning modules on “corporate codes”). In 2012 *Passport* was pioneer in disclosing the first SROI in France, since the first official report on social impact was only published one year later:

We developed a SROI calculation in 2012, and ANRU⁵ was very interested by our methodology, that is partly why they chose to support our project (project leader 1).

Some Anglo-Saxon charitable foundations asked then for SROI, they asked: do you have a SROI? That’s also the reason why we made it. But I think that this trend has passed now (senior manager 2).

This voluntary report was based on the methodology promoted by Essec, a renowned French Business School, very active in social entrepreneurship. Essec also provides *Passport* with academic support and recognition. It was a useful tool to convince ANRU, which steers the public budgets for social cohesion projects, to select *Passport* to undergo several projects. Both the skills of *Consulting1* and the network developed in the field of social entrepreneurship pushed forward the association. *Passport* notably signed a strategic agreement with the first French recruitment firm specialized in promoting diversity (hereafter called MRH), also an active social entrepreneur, involved in the “Companies and neighborhoods” network:

We are convinced that the early follow up of young people coming from popular areas, the connection with corporate professionals and the creation of networks will reduce the inequalities in access to employment (Press release- July 2014).

After signing a multiple-ministerial agreement in 2013, *Passport* gets, in 2014, an official recognition as a ‘public interest’ organization. This status opens to recruiting young volunteers for civic services, to getting tax advantages and to accessing to public subsidies including apprenticeship tax⁶, which increased the NPO’s resources. *Passport* develops then additional new programs, e.g. “Engineering Passport” to promote the culture of sciences and technology. These programs were supported by a 3-years public financing managed by ANRU, for which “they asked us (*Passport*) to apply to the call for project” (senior manager). *Passport* also starts developing its own network of alumni. Thanks to the “different leaders” community, a program of coaching and “inspiring meetings” they developed for postgraduate students and young graduates, “reflecting the diversity of French population” (*Passport* website) and funded by companies that joined the board in 2015.

⁵National Agency for Urban Renovation

⁶In France, companies are subject to an apprenticeship tax, calculated as a percentage of total payroll. They can choose voluntarily to which institutions this tax is paid. This tax represents a significant amount of funding.

3.2.3 Getting public recognition. Beginning of 2015, *Passport*'s influence on the field of equal opportunities and the French state support are evidenced in several ways. First, the dramatic terrorist attacks of 2015 generated both interest and confusion about its activities:

The question of equal opportunities is frequently polluted by issues on "*laïcité*". We say: "we work with young people from the neighborhoods" and immediately people ask us questions on the Islamic veil or on "*laïcité*". After the terrorist attacks, it was an eye-opener: we received lots of calls like: "we know what you do, it's great, but what do you do to prevent radicalization?" It partly cannibalizes the stakes (senior manager 1)

Second, winning the label "*la France s'engage*", *Passport* is recognized as an organization of social utility, enabling further developments of its activities nationwide:

As president, I see my role as a coach in our ongoing development. With the support of "*la France s'engage*" and the confidence of our private and public partners, we will convert the try in covering the whole country, and achieving the promise to promote the real equality to foster this diversity of talents that is more than ever necessary in our companies and for our country (President – book *Passport* 2015)

Several programs are developed to expand the missions of *Passport*, to "foster the skills of the 21st century" in innovation, and to "develop a professional ambition" for high school pupils in deprived areas (*Passport* website). Success in the call for social impact bonds (SIB) projects in 2016 opened perspectives to promote new equal opportunities programs:

The initial idea was to have a SIB with different ministries. Finally, after lengthy discussions, only the ministry of Agriculture stayed in the loop, for young people in agricultural high schools: it's an education "on the side". The idea is: perseverance of young people, removal of self-censorship before the professional baccalaureate, then support of undergraduate students by mentorship to fight school dropout. It's the culmination of several months of discussions with the Ministry about what we want to do, it's a co-creation... professional baccalaureate it's a new audience for us, there are some issues at stake here, we have to adapt our expertise (project leader 2).

This public recognition goes together with a recognition from the social and solidarity economy actors, demonstrated notably by the "P'ins" price received in 2017. Launched by a foundation and by *Avisé*⁷, this price is designed to support and accompany leaders of socially innovative projects in their replication strategy, to leverage social innovations.

3.2.4 The merger: becoming the field leader. Finally, the merger with a rival NPO in 2017 consolidated this extended influence over the field, despite internal tensions:

Many people left, and I am not sure that it is over (...). I think the main impact of the merger is the impact on people. To regain a shared culture, because finally people had different approaches, and stories of the associations were different, so sometimes it leads to fireworks between people who had different ways to work before. I frequently heard when I joined *Passport* that the two associations were competitors (project leader 2)

Some started in a small association, and they saw how the structure quickly grew. That raises questions on how to maintain a common association spirit, on a human scale, but with very large ambitions (manager 1).

⁷ *Avisé* is the engineering agency created in 2002 to develop social and solidarity economy in France.

Some employees believe in the model of equal opportunities sustained by the association, but others are more critical. These debates exist within the organization, but rather at the grassroots level (...) There is a rather important turnover among the teams, some of it is explained by these political debates, but there are also other things related to the way the organization works and to the human resources policy (researcher 1).

Tensions come thus both from conflicts of values and from the operational implementation of the new organization, leading to some frustrations. The new merged structure starts to operate in September 2018, in its new offices situated in a building named “the Ladder”, with reference to the “social ladder”. *AI* and MRH (the recruitment firm) jointly promote the “Ladder” to form an “ecosystem of associations”, with the underwritten support of a major French bank. The merger increases the hybridity of logics in *AI*, since *Passport* is a hybrid dominated by a market logic, and its former rival has more links with public organizations or researchers, inscribed in a state or social logic. It is also an opportunity to combine complementary networks of public and private partners to sustain a change of scale enabled by a digital turn:

Passport was born in a private company and is strongly embedded in the system of private companies. On our side, we were closer to institutional partners. Our founder was part of the administrative elite. So, there is a strategic fit among our networks (manager 1).

Proud of our results because, despite the burden of the merger, *AI* has started its change of scale! During the academic year 2017/2018, 50 000 young people benefited of the actions of *AI*, in face-to face or in digital mode, versus 20 000 in 2016/2017. Happy also to have promoted the creation of the Ladder, that materializes not only the reunion of the teams on a same location, but also the gathering of 19 associations committed for equal opportunities. We are convinced that to do great things, we must do together. Our merger is only a step. (founders 1&2– website editorial November 2018).

The co-founders insist then on the importance of “doing together” to obtain a dominant position in the field. Their vision is congruent with a market logic. The ambitions of *AI* are clearly widened: to influence directly the field in showing their ability to provide solutions:

We used to be an association doing a good job working in its corner, and now we are a bigger structure, more audible. We can start question public authorities, ask questions to private companies about their role, and finally have a bigger impact since we can support larger volumes with more tangible results (senior manager 1).

There is no reason why only companies merge, associations merge too, we take up the bet! First because the cause we deal with has become an emergency. With this merger, we think that very concretely we can become a more effective partner with the ministry of Education, that must manage large numbers: there must be large organizations to support it for collective success. Like companies, we face the digital wave and one must have the means to offer digital solutions with a strong impact: this requires money (founder 2 – BFMTV video – June 2017).

AI proclaims now itself the leader of the field, with around 100 persons (employees, skills-based sponsorship and civil services) working in a structure organized in four divisions respectively called: orientation / 21st century competencies (soft skills) / success (mentoring) / engagement (different leaders). Each division is directed by a manager, with several project leaders in charge of the operational side of the operations, in a rather hierarchical organizational scheme mirroring divisional firms. Each division has three strategic axes: “do”, with face-to-

face activities, “share” with a digital platform, and “influence” with researchers measuring impact and boosting the advocacy of *AI*, since the co-founders intensified their public talks:

We understand that it’s not in mentoring 2500 young people that we will radically change the picture! However, if tomorrow we manage to share our mentoring model with more actors, we would have a lot more impact. And we will change scale that way! It’s essential! The tool for this essential strategic axis digital. That way, we can share our tools and ensure that people seize our programs, with tools on a turnkey basis (manager 3).

Our goal is to gain a better understanding of our topics, with researchers who have really thought, and contribute to our topics. And that enables us to contribute to our advocacy, so that we make our voices heard by the institutions or the great public (manager 2).

We provide data, we provide information and then the communication and development teams pinch what interests them and format it, even if it makes us shout afterwards (laughs) it’s rather numbers flung without caution, which is frustrating for researchers (researcher 1).

For now, research is just beginning to feed the advocacy (...) it’s just little pieces of advocacy in activities that are not really advocacy but rather communication (researcher 2).

So, some tensions emerge around the status and the role of research in *AI*. Researchers express some doubts about the way their results are used in the advocacy to communicate. They are also frustrated that time-consuming operational issues stemming from the quick growth hinder their research projects, notably the digital growth. Among the new digital platforms, *Inspire*, dedicated to school orientation, is the first one released in September 2018. A link to the platform is provided for all students finishing high school who are asked to use the official platform *Parcoursup* to express their education choices of higher education. The *AI* platform reaches then potentially 800 000 students:

On the platform, we suggest potential orientation tracks to pupils, and then we ask them if they knew these tracks before, because there is an information issue on the platform, so we try to measure how many tracks are discovered thanks to *Inspire*... So far these are mainly indicators of the use of the platform, with the idea to have more qualitative data in a foreseeable future, like analyzing the content of the discussions⁸ (researcher 1).

This first digital step gives thus *AI* the potential to reach a large audience, but the actual impact needs to be further demonstrated and represents the next challenge of the NPO. Finally, in its current form, *AI* claims to be a flexible organization with permeable boundaries, mixing board members with varied status⁹, permanent staff and volunteers (young people in civic service and more mature volunteers in skills-based sponsorship or pro bono work), mentees and mentors, and former mentees still active in the community of different leaders. The NPO builds a strong network combining companies (administration board and mentor managers), public partners

⁸ On the platform, high school students may ask questions and chat with students about orientation.

⁹ From one elected deputy in 2017 of the presidential majority, to former beneficiaries, private funders, former education sector inspector.

(six ministries), other social entrepreneurs and converging associations forming an “ecosystem”, and a highly socialized alumni community. This network comprises also French and American investment banks and funds, willing to support this type of social innovations:

In the SIB project, the idea is that investors give money, we must analyze indicators, and the State will reimburse on the success of these indicators, so there was a whole financial model to build around that. It was the role of the bank and the fund in this project, and they gave us strong support for that. (project leader 2)

So, this networked hybrid organizational form is also ripe for the hybridity of logics.

3.3 ORGANIZATIONAL HYBRIDITY OF LOGICS OR DOMINATION OF THE MARKET LOGIC?

Passport’s goal was inscribed in a social logic. However, it initially defined equal opportunities as the mentoring of students originating from deprived areas, trained to know corporate codes and to become “different leaders”, conforming to a market logic. After the merger, the two founders change *AI*’s definition of equal opportunities to encompass its change of scale:

Give to all, massively and not by way of exception, an equal freedom to choose their own future, regardless of their origin (founders 1&2- website editorial November 2018).

But this definition is not necessarily shared by all *AI* employees:

There is a very meritocratic dimension in the association: we take pupils who already have good results and bring them to do long studies hoping that once they reach elite positions they will remember that they came from an exploited social background, and they will improve things for the people at the bottom of social ladder...I do not believe in this vision of equal opportunities. I am more attached to simple equality (researcher 1).

The society does not change, but we don’t change it either! Because we merely duplicate what big companies can do, we do not necessarily give the floor to those who could speak up (project leader 2).

Some employees feel thus uncomfortable with the elitist vision of equal opportunities shared by the cofounders of *AI*, since they do not share the liberal vision and the acceptance of social stratification entailed in the concept of equal opportunities. Volunteers, mentors and former mentees are on their side essentially embedded in the social logic, using words like “mutual help” or “save the students of deprived places” (former mentee), “rightful giving-back” or “needs to give meaning to my life” (mentors).

The SROI and evaluation tools are mainly designed to satisfy the state logic. In its interactions with the public representatives, the state is asked for concrete actions and measurement of these actions, since social inequality is regularly a hot political topic. Local public organizations ask for data to measure the impact of the orientation programs for example. But as described in the evolution of this field, many public actions, especially those connected to urban policy and social cohesion, are developed in the frame of public-private partnerships where the

involvement of private companies seems to guarantee efficiency per se through a market logic. And the question of impact is also raised by some of the private partners.

For private companies, sitting on the board or being active members in the mentorship programs of *AI* is a way to implement their CSR programs in partnership with an organization that understands their needs better than other national associations:

We have built a trusting relationship. It's important that they have local support to structure the partnerships and they are very good at it. Their excellence program is close to our business. When they talk to us, they don't do name-dropping of ministers, they are humble. I like this specific approach which comes from the business world: they are very respectful of our independence towards public or political actors (partner company).

Nevertheless, some companies involved are more inclined to act on social issues and have thus been selected on the board of *AI* to help its further development. As a former corporate relations officer of the main network of private companies investing in social innovation, the founder shares his vision on the role of companies in society:

At first, it was difficult to convince my company that this project made sense, to mobilize experienced employees to mentor young people still at school. In 2005, it has slightly changed now, French companies did not assume then that they have a political role to play, that they have answers on some social issues. Back then, companies were centered on business issues, and tended not to speak on political issues, concerning school, there was a fear of ideological barriers, somewhat fantasized, because I have not met them that often (founder 1).

Although they have different profiles, both founders of *AI* managed to get support from various ministries and public actors who helped their way to public recognition. The NPO acts increasingly in a hierarchical way, far from the democratically controlled association which is traditionally embedded in the social logic. New employees of *AI* are mainly high-qualified people in communication and entrepreneurship, socially skilled for networking, with practices directly derived from the business or the social entrepreneurship community. Finally, a very professional communication strategy supports the quick growth of *AI*. First, all mentors receive an e-learning training and “communication kits” designed by *AI* for each specific workshop with pupils organized throughout France. Second, the communities of “ambassadors” or “different leaders” gather regularly for social events to create a sense of belonging. Different leaders also attend at least once a year a weekend of meetings, including media training techniques to be able to perform “inspiring talks”, or “pitches”. Third, active communication campaigns are organized on the social networks to support the new programs and platforms. For example, more than 70 videos have been uploaded so far on YouTube promoting the NPO, its delegates, or different leaders' testimonies. *AI* is thus actively willing to share its practices with other actors, and broadly influence the field. *AI*'s communication is based on a combination of rationality (figures and impact reports) and emotions, with pictures and

inspiring stories. Stories told by mentees about their own trajectory and the positive impact of *AI*'s programs may be recalled and propagated further, since they facilitate personal connections with the listener. In many instances, interviewees noted the emotional impact of the storytelling during the “inspiring meetings” gathering young different leaders and business leaders. Pictures show “happy” young people in action, especially from visible minority youth, presented as the new faces of success. Accordingly, both the leadership of the NPO, the hierarchical governance and the professionalization of the NPO in the development of partnerships and communication events make the market logic dominant in this organizational institutional complexity.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper contributes to the literature on hybrid organizations, that gain prevalence in the contemporary world (Kraatz et Block, 2008; Pache et Santos 2013; Besharov et Smith, 2014; Smith et Besharov, 2017). While recent literature has mainly focused on the strategies developed by hybrids to manage tensions and opportunities (Battilana et al., 2017), we show how hybrids emerge in institutional complexity, and how they reflect the tensions between logics of an emerging turbulent field, and progressively gain influence.

First, recent literature on hybrid organizations has focused on social enterprises combining aspects of business and charity forms at their core (Jay, 2013; Pache et Santos, 2013; Ramus et al., 2017). Our case study analyses a hybrid of a specific nature, an organizational hybrid form created by a founder driven by a social mission but embedded in CSR practices inscribed in a market logic. The hybrid moves then towards social and state logics in its growth process, managing progressively a strong network of private and public partners. This hybrid envisages mainly equal opportunities as facilitating the access to the labour market and to elite positions of socially diverse profiles, contributing thus to CSR programs promoting diversity inside companies. The initial hybrid organisational contractual form turned quickly into a legal autonomous association. It is perceived best addressing social needs (Pache et Santos, 2013), serving thus the social logic and fitting into social entrepreneurship networks. However, governance processes and structure of the NPO reflect practices embedded in a market logic. In line with Besharov et Smith (2014), our results show that most of the managers act as carriers of the market logic through their practices. These managers are socialized inside the studied hybrid or within partnerships developed as part of private companies' CSR policies. They help volunteers to develop professional communication practices and further develop their

mentoring tools to share them with other actors thanks to their digital turn, striving to have their practices radiate at the field level (Smets et al., 2012). Even though they may feel emotionally committed (Pache et Santos, 2013; Toubiana et Zietsma, 2017) to the social logic, their mostly liberal and elitist vision of equal opportunities is embedded in a market logic.

Besides, even if *AI*'s former mentees express values of altruism in accordance with a social logic, their loyalty makes them prone to diffuse the (market) message of the NPO. Mentees perform their own storytelling of success, that provides an effective vehicle for self-legitimation (Maclean et al., 2012), and is a strategic communication material for the NPO. Moreover, when volunteers experience conflicts between their own social logic and the organization's dominant market logic, they have limited influence on the organizational identity because of their short involvement in time and of the hierarchical governance process. Results reveal also an internal conflict of values rekindled by the merger with a rival NPO, that mainly induced new turnover. Second, our results show that both hybrid NPOs reflect and tie in with the tensions generated by the French state logic. The Jacobin state is at the same time a centralising actor, with Parisian centrally made decisions, and a decentralising actor promoting regions. This paradox generates a centralised and fragmented field (Greenwood et al., 2011). To become an influent actor within this field, the studied hybrid embraces the state logic using rational evaluation tools for accountability purposes and developing regional offices to promote equal opportunities between territories. It mimics thus the tensions of the state logic, caught between centralized decisions and decentralized implemented programs. This generates potential conflicts of logics between local teams implementing and central actors deciding. Furthermore, the SIB program evidences a process of co-creation between the ministry and the hybrid, blending state and social logics to try to fight school dropout in agricultural high schools.

Third, literature suggests that managing organizational tensions within institutional complexity is challenging in situations of environmental turbulence (Reay et Hinings, 2009; Ramus et al., 2017). Our results show that the violent episodes pointing at social inequalities in France created emotional investments in the field's changes (Toubiana et Zietsma, 2017). They generated first an emotional commitment to the social logic, but then the increasing focus on potential threats to laicism induced a turnaround of public policies to fight radicalization, producing even more complexity in this already fragmented field. This favoured the development of public-private initiatives in deprived areas, and opened opportunities for a strategic hybrid organization to become a visible actor in the field. Consistent with Kodeih et

Greenwood (2014), our study shows thus that institutional complexity expands the social referent groups of organizations and makes current institutionalized arrangements less relevant. In our case, other associations and public-private initiatives were created at the same time, and the new networks of social entrepreneurs was very active in increasing the scope of their actions, contributing also to infuse the social logic with market practices.

Paradoxically, even though the hybrid organization discloses very small impact factors comparatively to the national figures at stake, it still raises in importance due to the great skills of its cofounders in building active networks to get financial and symbolic support. The merger and the new digital step in 2018 enable the organization to change scale. Under the scope of the social logic, social missions are perceived as better achieved by organizations with strong ties to the local communities (Ramus et al., 2017), so the studied hybrid continues face-to-face activities such as mentoring. But first, digital platforms enable to solve tensions between the local and the remote so that the hybrid can be ubiquitous. Second, considered as a strategic axis of development, in line with a market logic, digital platforms pave the way for projects with a true national impact. These may be dedicated to an expansion on the market of student orientation, for school and career counselling. But they could also be more political. The will to empower youth from visibly diverse backgrounds may resonate with communalism. It contributes thus to the sensitive debate on equality in a country where the republican pact is historically rejecting any notion of community.

REFERENCES

- Archambault, E. (2015). France: A late-comer to government-nonprofit partnership. *Voluntas*, 26, 2283-2310.
- Barles, S. (2001). Complexité et mutabilité du concept d'égalité. *Hommes et Migrations*, 1232, 83-89.
- Battilana, J., et Besharov, M., et Mitzinneck, B. (2017). On hybrids and hybrid organizing: a review and roadmap for future research. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. Lawrence, R. Meyer (Eds) *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* 2nd edition, London: Sage, 128-162.
- Battilana, J., et Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing: Insights from the study of social enterprises. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 397-441.
- Bénéton, P. (1990). Inégalité. In S. Aurox (Ed.), *Les notions philosophiques*, Paris : PUF.
- Besharov, M.L., et Smith, W.K. 2014. Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explaining their varied nature and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39 (3), 364–381.
- Bouchard, M., et Bourque G.L., et Lévesque B., et Desjardins E. (2001). L'évaluation de l'économie sociale dans la perspective des nouvelles formes de régulation socio-économique de l'intérêt général, *Cahiers de recherche sociologique*, 35, 31-53
- Chelle, E. (2017). La philanthropie aux Etats-Unis et en France. Retour sur une traditionnelle opposition. *Sociologie*, 8(4), 395-408.
- Denis, J.-L., et Ferlie, E., et Van Gestel, N. (2015). Understanding hybridity in public organizations. *Public Administration*, 93(2), 273–289.
- Dubet, C. (2010). *Les paradoxes de l'égalité des chances*. <https://www.inegalites.fr/Les-paradoxes-de-l-egalite-des-chances>, website of Observatoire des inégalités, consulted 7/2/2018
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Friedland, R., et Alford, R.B. (1991). Bringing society back. In *Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (Eds, Powell, W.W., Di Maggio, P.J.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 232-266.
- Greenwood, R., et Raynard, M., et Kodeih, F., et Micelotta, E. R., et Lounsbury, M. (2011). Institutional Complexity and Organizational Responses. *The Academy of Management Annals* 5 (1), 317-371.
- Glynn, M.A., et Raffaelli, R. (2013). Logic Pluralism, Organizational Design, and Practice Adoption: The Structural Embeddedness of CSR Programs, in Lounsbury, M. Boxenbaum, E. (eds.) *Institutional Logics in Action* (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, vol. 39 Part B), 175 – 197.
- Jenson, J. (2004). Canada's New Social Risks: Directions for a New Social Architecture, *Canadian Policy Research Network*, paper N F43, 1-35.
- Jay, J. (2013). Navigating paradox as a mechanism of change and innovation in hybrid organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1), 137-159.
- Kodeih, F., et Greenwood, R. (2014). Responding to Institutional Complexity: The Role of Identity. *Organization Studies*. 35(1), 7–39

- Koubi, G., et Guglielmi, G.J. (2000). *L'égalité des chances. Analyses, évolutions, perspectives*. Paris : La Découverte.
- Kraatz, M. S., et Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, et R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, London: Sage, 243-275.
- Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24 (4), 691-710.
- Macleane, M., et Harvey, C., et Chia, R. (2011). Sensemaking, storytelling and the legitimization of elite business careers. *Human Relations* 65(1), 17-40
- Maguire, S., et Hardy, C., et Lawrence, T.B. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47 (5), 657-679.
- Ocasio, W., et Mauskopf, M., et Steel, C. (2016). History, Society and Institutions: the role of collective memory in the emergence and evolution societal logics. *Academy of Management Review*. 41(4), 676-699.
- Pache, A.C., et Santos, F. (2013). Inside the Hybrid Organization: Selective Coupling as a Response to Competing Institutional Logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56 (4), 972-1001.
- Powell, W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. In B. Staw et LL. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Greenwich CT, 12, 295-336.
- Ramus, T., et Vaccaro, A., et Brusoni, S. (2017). Institutional Complexity in Turbulent Times: Formalization, Collaboration, and the Emergence of Blended Logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(4), 253-1284.
- Reay, T., et Hinings, C.R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization Studies*, 30 (6), 629-652.
- Schnapper, D. (1987). Unité nationale et particularismes culturels. *Commentaire*, 38, 361-365.
- Sillince, J.A.A, et Brown, A.D. (2009). Multiple organizational identities and legitimacy: The rhetoric of police websites. *Human Relations*, 62(12), 1829-1856.
- Simon, P. (2015). La lutte contre les discriminations n'a pas eu lieu. La France multiculturelle et ses adversaires. *Mouvements* 83(3), 87-96.
- Smets, M., et Morris, T., et Greenwood, R. (2012). From practice to field: A multilevel model of practice-driven institutional change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55 (4), 877-904.
- Smith, W., et Besharov, M. (2017). Bowing before Dual Gods: How Structured Flexibility Sustains Organizational Hybridity, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-44
- Supiot, A. (2019). *La force d'une idée*, Paris : Les liens qui libèrent.
- Terrail, J-P. (2002). *De l'inégalité scolaire*, Paris : La Dispute.
- Thornton, P., et Ocasio, W., et Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective – A new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toubiana, M., et Zietsma, C. (2017). The Message is on the Wall? Emotions, Social Media and the Dynamics of Institutional Complexity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60 (3), 922-953.