**Social identity regulation of ‘entrepreneur worker’ for information systems employees and implications of its hybridization for inter-groups power relationships**

Review and Summary Comments

I have reviewed your manuscript and made lots of edits and suggestions, as well as comments in places where I was unsure how best to proceed.

The point of your study is, in general, easy to understand. I was able to understand what the aim of your research was, your methodological approach, your data analytic techniques, and the conclusions and implications of the research. However, I there are a lot of places where you could provide greater clarity and detail regarding:

1. The motivation for the research
2. The specific research question(s)
3. The method used (i.e., grounded theory)
4. The interview guide
5. The process used and choices made in analyzing the data
6. The implications both for organizations and for the field of CMS.

As you can see, I have made extensive edits to try to simplify/clarify the language. I believe that the majority of these edits are straightforward and unlikely to cause any controversy. However, there were a few places where I felt that the language needed modifying but I did not feel confident in my understanding of your ideas. I have left comments in these places asking you for further explanation, or just to check that I have not misrepresented you.

I hope my feedback is useful – please let me know if you need any clarification on any of my comments or suggestions for changes.

It is a very interesting paper and I wish you all the best with getting it published.

Here is some more specific feedback, most of which can also be found as comments on the marked-up copy of your manuscript.

1. Terminology/acronyms – Many of these need spelling out the first time they are used, even if the typical reader of your paper will know what they mean (e.g., CMS, HRM, TI)
2. Throughout the manuscript, there are several variants of the phrase you use for your new social identity, including:
   1. Ideal Entrepreneur SI
   2. 'entrepreneur worker’ SI
   3. Ideal Entrepreneur worker SI
   4. Ideal ‘entrepreneur worker’ SI

I recommend using one term (with the same capitalization) throughout.

1. Use of “CMS” - I find many of the sentences that include “CMS” hard to parse due to the use of CMS as an agent (e.g., “CMS show”, “CMS have noticed”)
   1. critical management studies have/has no agency and therefore cannot be said to notice things
   2. Does CMS refer to the \*field\* of critical management studies (singular) or to a set of studies (plural)?

Here are some constructions I think work better:

Researchers in the field of CMS have noticed…

Authors of critical management studies have noticed…

According to the CMS literature...

1. There are two specific terms that appear many times and that I had difficulty making sense of:
   1. Contested (as in “contested hybridized SI” or “contested dual identity”) – In what sense is the dual identity "contested"? Is it deemed inappropriate by management? Do employees deny holding these dual identities? Or is the whole concept of a dual identity contested in the literature?

Or does this mean "contesting" in the sense of competition? If so, then I recommend changing all uses of "contested" to "competing"

* 1. Injunction – this typically means a restriction in what one is allowed to do, but you seem to be using it in the sense of a directive or mandate – would one of those be better words?

1. Unclear pronoun references. There are several places where “it” or “its” is used, but it is not clear to me what “it” is. These are noted in the manuscript.
2. Repetition – There are several phrases and concepts that are repeated throughout the manuscript. Although I agree that repetition can be very helpful in reminding readers about key concepts/techniques, there are places where I recommend spelling out the precise meanings of these phrases, such that a reader who is not immersed in the terminology of CMS can understand your arguments.

Examples include: neo/normative control/regime, post-bureaucratic, hybridized SI, and phrases such as

“the ideal type of SI that top-down mechanisms of neo-normative control construct a priori in order to influence bottom-up sense-making of employees”

“top-down regulative forces and mechanisms of neo-normative control (working through HRM mechanisms)”

“Neo-liberal and (self) authenticitynotions disseminating into organizations, interwoven into common language we term ‘entrepreneurship’ which underpins the neo-normative regime”

1. Use of woven/interwoven, in places where it is not clear which things are woven together (e.g., “contemporary forms of managerial regimes have been interwoven into hybridized mechanisms of control regulating hybridized SI”, “contemporary turbulent, post-bureaucratic organizations enact interwoven mechanisms of control, and consequently SIs become entangled”, “CMS show that current organizations enact woven normative managerial control which in turn shapes contested hybridized SI”)
2. Use of “ideal” (as in ideal worker SI) - Consider whether to expand on what "ideal" means. Does it mean an idealized reference point?? Or something else? And is it necessary to refer to an "ideal SI", or is just "SI" sufficient?
3. Regulation of SI - What does it mean to "regulate" SI. You use the term a lot but have not really described what you mean by it. Is it the promotion or endorsement of an SI? This would not really be regulation. You also refer to feedback mechanisms, which sounds more like regulation, but how does feedback regulate SI? Is there a deliberative, cognitively aware process on the part of HR to remove elements of the 'incorrect' SI and replace it with one that fits the organization's values/identity/aspirations? Or is all this much more implicit? Also, how is workplace SI defined and measured? How can we tell whether an SI has changed and whether that change is a result of a regulatory/feedback process?
4. Conclusion of literature review - I think the lit review section would benefit from a concluding paragraph in which you lay out the aims (research questions) of your research and describe (briefly) the method and setting/participants you have chosen (and why) in order to explore the competing SIs and also their effect on organizational relationships.

**Methods and results:**

1. You open the methods section by saying that you take an epistemological view. What kind of epistemological view? Depending on who you ask, there are multiple different such views. Given the methods you use, I would assume an interpretive or constructivist view (?)
2. Do you seek out IRB/research ethics committee approval? And did you get written informed consent from the participants?

It may be the case that the journal is willing to let low-risk social science studies proceed without ethical approval, but written, informed participant consent is still important.

Therefore, I suggest you add a sentence or two explaining whether you got IRB/REC approval, or whether the committee determined this research to be exempt, and how you obtained and documented consent.

1. Consider including of a copy of your interview guide as an appendix.

You could also consider including the transcripts (unless there are ethical restrictions on sharing the discourse of the employees you interviewed – in which case I will reiterate the need for consent in reproducing excerpts of your interviews with them in the manuscript).

1. Grounded theory – consider adding a few sentences explaining the key idea of this approach and why you chose it for this study/research question. Why not use other qualitative techniques? Why not use quantitative methods?
2. Consider giving more detail on the process and decisions made during data analysis with respect to choosing what to report and who to quote; how you categorized responses