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**תקציר**

המאמר מבוסס על מחקר גישוש איכותני שנעשה ביחידה למערכות מידע (IS - Information Systems) של הזכיין הישראלי של חברה רב-לאומית (MNC multinational company) ליצור ולהפצת משקאות.

המאמר מציג טיעון: הזדהות אירגונית מלמעלה-למטה עם זהות חברתית של יזם אידיאלי (IESI – Ideal entrepreneur social identity) במפעל ייצור ישראלי ותיק של טכנולוגיה פשוטה עם מסורת משפחתית.

בהתבסס על תיאוריות אירגוניות ביקורתיות, המאמר מדגים הזדהות ארגונית חדשה, מלמעלה-למטה, של יזם-בן משפחה (top-down EMF - Entrepreneur – family member ), כיחסים מבוססי- כח, בין מנהלי IS חדשים בדרגות ביניים – המחזיקים כוח סימלי וחברתי – ועובדי IS.

**מבוא**

המאמר מבוסס על מחקר גישוש איכותני שנעשה ביחידה למערכות מידע (IS) של הזכיין הישראלי של חברה רב-לאומית (MNC) ליצור ולהפצת משקאות. ההתייחסות לחברה היא בשם העט *אפריטיף* כדי לשמור על סודיות. המאמר מדגים את המבנה של זהות-אירגונית מעלה-מטה: יזם – בן משפחה (EMF). מראים בו התפתחות של זהות כפולה זו דרך ניסיונות מתמשכים, מלמעלה למטה, של קבוצה מקצועית חדשה ובעלת השפעה של מנהלי יחידת מערכות מידע (IS Division), שקשורה לטכנולוגיה עילית (הי-טק) . מנהלים אלו מנסים לשכנע את עובדי יחידת ה- IS להזדהות עם ערכים ונקודות מבט מקצועיות שהם רואים כדומיננטיות, בעלות ערך ומאחדות לקבוצה המקצועית. דרישות חדשות אלו, שדורשות מהעובדים להזדהות עם הזהות החברתית של הקבוצה המקצועית (SI- social identity), סותרות את הזהות המסורתית ארוכת השנים של אפריטיף. הזהות הארגונית של EMF מלמעלה-למטה שמתגלה במאמר זה נוצרה בצומת שבין זהות חברתית של יזם אידיאלי (IESI) שמתאימה לתכונות הרצויות של הקבוצה, לבין הזהות החברתית של בן-משפחה (FMSI – family member social identity) שאפיינה את הזהות החברתית הכללית הקודמת באפריטיף.

בהתאם לכך, המאמר טוען שהמנהלים החדשים ביחידת מערכות המידע באפריטיף משתמשים בעמדת הכוח שלהם, בהון התרבותי ובחומרים תאגידיים כדי להפיץ ולהטמיע את המושגים החדשים, שקשורים להי-טק. היחסים ההדדיים בין ההערכות של הנהלת יחסי אנוש (HRM) לבין מנגנוני המשוב והבקרה האירגונית של יזמות יוצרים IESI, שהמאמר מציג מול ה- FMSI הקודמת.

**סקר ספרות**

***מבנה הזהות החברתית***

זהות חברתית (SI) מקשרת את היחיד באופן רגשי וקוגניטיבי עם קבוצה קונקרטית או דמיונית, מכיוון שהיא "מספקת תשובות מתאימות הקשר (קונטקסט) לשאלות ‘מי אני?` או ‘מי אנחנו`" (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008, p.327). אשפורת' ושות' (2008) טוענים ש- SI הוא מושג מקיף שכולל את מבנה הזהות האירגונית. בהקשר האירגוני, SI יכולה לקשר את היחיד לתכונה דומיננטית מאחדת של כל הארגון (Foreman and Whetten, 2002). לעומת זאת, קשר כזה יכול להתייחס ליחידה תת-אירגונית או ליחידה בין-תחומית (Parker, 2000), חברת בת (George and Chattopadhyay, 2005; Reade, 2001), קבוצה מקצועית (Gill and Larson, 2014) או עמדות תפקיד, כמו בעלי מקצוע או יזמים (Chasserio, Pailot, & Poroli, 2014; Stewart, Castrogiovanni, & Hudson, 2016).

במחקרים אירגוניים מבוססי פרדיגמה בונה, תהליכי משא ומתן ועיצוב מחדש של SI מתרחשים בהקשר יחסי-סימלי ולא בהקשר אובייקטיבי-מהותי. SI מגלמת או מתיישרת עם ציפיות חברתיות ודרישות להתנהגות הולמת, רגשות ומחשבות שקשורות להקשר ארגוני מסויים (Serpe & Stryker, 2011). בהתאם לכך, SI מאוחדת, נשמרת ומשתנה כתוצאה מהשפעות חברתיות-תרבותיות חיצוניות (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Gill & Larson, 2014).

זהות חברתית, SI, בניגוד לתפקיד, אינה רק עמדה של היחיד במערך חברתי מסוים, אלא מעוררת תחושת הזדהות (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004). חוקרים מקשרים מושגית בין זהות חברתית (SI) לבין הזדהות (Identification) , (Ashforth et al., 2008): " הזדהות מוצגת כאשר יחידים ממזגים בהגדרה העצמית שלהם מאפיינים לא-אישיים או מופשטים של קבוצות שאליהן הם משתייכים" (George & Chattopadhyay, 2005, p.69).

אשפורת' ושות' (2008) מנתחים הזדהות אירגונית כמשחק גומלין בין תהליכי מעלה-מטה ותהליכי מטה-מעלה. תהליכי הזדהות מטה-מעלה מצביעים על מאמצים סובייקטיביים של יחידים להפעיל זהות חברתית קונטקסטואלית על-ידי מתן משמעות להתנסויות שלהם (Ashforth et al., 2008; Van Vuuren, Teurlings, & Bohlmeijer, 2012). בניגוד לכך, תהליכי הזדהות מעלה-מטה מאירים נסיונות של קבוצות פנים-אירגוניות בעלות השפעה לשכנע עובדים להזדהות עם SI ספציפית (Ashforth et al., 2008). שכנוע כזה יכול להיות מופעל באמצעות מנגנונים אירגוניים: מערכות יחסים, התנהגויות וסמלים (Cardador & Pratt, 2006). במלים אחרות, תהליכי מטה-מעלה משקפים ניסיונות של קבוצה פנים-אירגונית בעלת השפעה להשפיע על יצירת המשמעות של אחרים בארגון.

בניית SI עשויה להוביל ליצירת זהויות אירגוניות דואליות או מרובות שמתבטאות במנהגים, מבנים וציפיות סותרים. כשלעצמן, הן מאפשרות את הקיום המשותף של מערכות ערכים מרובות (Foreman &d Whetten, 2002). בהתאם לכך, פורמן וווטן (2002), בוחנים אירגון בעל זהות כפולה ושתי מערכות מבוססות-ערכים: נורמטיבית – שמדגישה דימוי משותף של משפחה – ותועלתנית, שמקדמת ערכי ם מונעי-עסקים (כמו מקסום רווחים, אנוכיות והגיון כלכלי).

***Control-Based Social Identity in Critical Management Theory***

SI can be imposed by top-down culturalism in organizations (Parker, 2000). Interest groups (e.g., management or professional groups) that function as “crafters of institutions” (Muzio et al., 2013) may use SI as a management tool to achieve power (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004). Professional groups’ claims to an esoteric knowledge base and jurisdiction (Abbott, 1988; Adler & Kwon, 2013) legitimize reshaping and regulating the SI of employees in knowledge-intensive positions by offering them a common language. By doing so, they enable employees to realize who they are and understand the nature of their world (Alvesson, 2001).

In the same vein, critical management theory considers identity a societal-discursive construction, stressing the contribution of discourses to SI construction, maintenance and transformation (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Gill & Larson, 2014). This article accepts Gill and Larson’s definition of discourse-related identity: “Discourse signals the available and overarching combinations of assumptions, ideologies and histories that inform everyday language and practice” (Gill & Larson, 2014, p.520-521).

Recent studies discuss SI construction discourse as a means of organizational control. The negotiation, reshaping and transformation of SI is treated as an organizational control mechanism that is drawn contextually from managerial discourses (Alvesson & Willmott 2002; Kärreman & Alvesson, 2001; Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004).

Scholars differentiate between two preeminent patterns of organizational control-based SI construction: Normative and bureaucratic control. Whereas normative control is a managerial “attempt to elicit and direct the required efforts of members by controlling the underlying experience, thoughts, and feelings that guide their actions” (Kunda, 1992, p.11), bureaucratic control attempts to regulate members’ direct actions. In line with bureaucratic control, managements employ procedures, systems, plans and arrangements to measure and evaluate employee behavior and output. These two types of controls are not merely complementary organizational units, but rather interact symbolically. Accordingly, subordination and obedience are not simply components of a bureaucratic structure, but articulate the interpretations, ideas and orientations of the managers and employees who exercise them (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004).

This article demonstrates top-down organizational identification with IESI, bringing about dual organizational identification of EFM. Accordingly, the article discusses the top-down attempts of a professional group of new IS managers who seek to influence IS employees to identify with IESI in a low-tech work environment. These top-down attempts to foster identification with IESI intersect with the prevailing FMSI, resulting in EFM organizational identification.

**Methodology and Design**

The article is based on exploratory research, using qualitative methods, conducted at the IS division of an Israeli low-tech corporation. אפריטיף is a long-standing Israeli branch of MNC for production and distribution of beverages. The IS Division at אפריטיף employs 90 persons and comprises two units: Application Department Information Systems (ADIS) and Infrastructure Department Information Systems (IDIS), each divided into six work teams of 2-16 employees. At the upper echelons of the IS Division are three managers: A division manager and two department managers, responsible for 12 mid-level team managers. The present exploratory research is based on 11 semi-structured, in-depth interviews with six mid-high team managers (three team managers from each department) and five IDIS and ADIS employees.

This exploratory research took place as part of a broader study, that included 44 interviews. The interviews were conducted in diverse functional units of אפריטיף by a team of five scholars, including the authors of this article. The scholars are members in the "מכון כנרת לאתיקה יישומית בארגונים"[[3]](#footnote-3) Their objective was to explore corporate ethics and its manifestations in organizational culture and employee behavior. The interview questions generally focused on the participants’ subjectivity regarding their professional and social experiences in the workplace, as well as their relationships with peers, subordinates and superiors.

During analysis of IS Division employee interviews, employees claimed they experienced incivility and insults in the context of an emergent top-down organizational identification. As a result, these 11 interviews were analyzed separately and a different conceptual focus was applied. Significant SI and top-down dual organizational identification themes were identified that can be presented as a separate exploratory research.

**Data Analysis**

***Established Bureaucratic-Familial Organizational Controls***

As a veteran low-tech firm of considerable size, אפריטיף has a robust bureaucratic structure, manifested in a steep hierarchy, intensive labor division and strict role definitions. IS Division managers describe אפריטיף as a traditional, conservative and non-innovative organization. They note that bureaucratic procedures stifle innovation, that is most required in the IS Division work environment. As one manager suggests: “אפריטיף has a very conservative view, an old-fashioned perspective. אפריטיף is not a hi-tech company; it has an old manufacturing plant economy.”

Managers complain that they spend much of their time on routine administrative work, such as email reading and replying and work report documentation. In particular, they point out management and work team meetings as the greatest time-consuming requirement, indicating that routine meetings and administrative assignments do not allow them the time to think creatively about long-range professional issues. One manager describes his routine agenda as follows:

Fifty percent of my time is spent at various meetings and 40%-50% on office work: Employee management, assignment, emails, administrative action, control of professional procedures, development documentation, methodology and inspection of programmers, client support, work with suppliers, project management... I am involved in many interfaces: Clients, colleagues, subordinates and my direct superior... The rest of the time, which is roughly ten minutes, I engage in professional or technical work.

The bureaucratic structure prevails in conjunction with established normative control, based on a family set of values. Most IS Division employees have worked at אפריטיף for more than 20 years and have tenure status. Furthermore, the employee turnover rate is low. אפריטיף has a well-developed corporate welfare policy, driven to generate employment security and an atmosphere of solidarity through organizational training and development programs, as well as entertainment, as some participants indicate:

Team Manager: Yes, people are proud to say that they work at אפריטיף. The company tries to create a positive experience for the employees. I haven’t seen such a welfare system anywhere else: Coupons, gifts… You feel that the company invests in its employees. The management really cares.

Employee: אפריטיף conducts many social events that connect our family to the company: Couples’ trips, family trips, even a company excursion. We look forward to these events. They connect us to the company and it is marvelous. It is truly great here.

With this long-standing atmosphere of care and consideration, it is not surprising that a corporate culture based on family practices and conventions has evolved. Employees and managers often indicate that they consider אפריטיף as a family; they feel that אפריטיף is their home. A team manager says:

First and foremost, אפריטיף is a family-oriented company. All the employees and middle managers feel like a family—and I say this with full confidence. It is pleasant to be together. There is a good atmosphere; we help each other, share our experiences, eat together and laugh. I like the people at the company very much.

IS Division employees depict warm and close relationships between peers and between employees and their managers in each of the IS units (Infrastructures and Applications), enhancing solidarity and a sense of pride. Employees from the same work team or department usually meet at social and family occasions held at the workplace or elsewhere after working hours. As one employee demonstrates:

In our department, the atmosphere is excellent, people are friends with one another and it is fun to come to work […]. This means that we order food and eat together, celebrate birthdays, go to lunch in the dining room together. We have customs of our own: Those who go abroad bring chocolate for the others. Sometimes we meet together with the families…

***Top-Down organizational Identification with IESI***

*Measuring and feedback practices as a means of top-down organizational identification*

In recent years, high-ranking אפריטיף management has strengthened bureaucratic control by introducing cross-organizational HRM procedures of assessment, regulation and feedback, ensuring efficient control of employees’ accomplishments and performance. In accordance with the meritocratic model, employees are rewarded or sanctioned as a result of their performance evaluation.

The feedback procedure אפריטיף implements uses an HRM assessment tool that demonstrates symbolic interactions between two types of organizational control: Bureaucratic and entrepreneurial, as this article will show.

The feedback process takes place every six months, replacing the previous annual assessment schedule. The manager and employee fill out the feedback form separately, in preparation for their joint feedback meetings, during which they discuss the similarities and differences in their perspectives regarding the employee’s professional performance. As a result of this joint discussion, both manager and employee agree on either immediate or long-term feasible work goals that will improve the employee’s professional achievements. In this organizational procedure, the employee is expected to be an active partner who exhibits initiative and suggests professional self-improvement. At the end of the feedback procedure, the manager grades the employee on a scale of 1 to 10, according to common criteria.

This feedback process occurs at all managerial echelons. Grades are processed by the HRM Division and used to generate an overall statistical report ranking all אפריטיף divisions and determining the employees’ career trajectory. A low rank could result in a reprimand or threat of dismissal. While employees are expected to be totally involved in evaluating themselves throughout the feedback procedure, they have no control or input regarding its consequences.

The feedback procedure is not simply a neutral ingredient in a bureaucratic structure, but rather articulates symbolic interactions between two types of organizational control (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004). In line with this claim, the feedback is a kind of *subjectification*, a modality of normative control (Alvesson, 2001). The feedback process at אפריטיף embodies interpretations and meanings regarding the dispositions of the IESI. The feedback procedure articulates the management’s expectations regarding IESI capabilities, i.e., acting as a responsible and innovative human being. Employees have the feeling that as equal partners, they are ostensibly free to decide about their role assignments and professional destinies.

One IS employee notes the change he undergoes following the feedback. In his own words, he demonstrates the management’s expectations of IESI: That he assume responsibility for his work assignments and as a result, become an autonomous entity who manages himself:

For example, in the project, I do not know if I was considered dependent or not, so I would share what I did. I informed my manager about a minor accomplishment of mine and she responded: “You don’t have to show me every little thing that you do. You can work and show me from time to time.” I decided to focus on that, to be more independent in the field and to address her only with things that are really necessary. She accepted it… I paid attention and started changing my attitude […] There are regular meetings once every two weeks or once a month, mostly for technical matters, but actually, we self-manage. We are adults. They trust us and believe in us.

Contrary to the management’s intentions, some IS employees articulate their dissatisfaction and inconvenience with the self-ranking and evaluation process. In the following quotation, an employee describes the mental difficulty entailed by the feedback procedure:

I find the feedback process embarrassing, especially because I have to fill it in myself… On the one hand, I don’t want to say that I do not do anything or that I fail to do things, but on the other, I don’t want to say that I do things marvelously… I don’t want people to say that I think too highly of myself… I think that the feedback process is not very efficient. There are managers who will never give you a 10... You know, those who say that 10 is for God and 9 is for the General Manager… and then they rank you lower. I do not intend to say anything too good about myself.

Kärreman and Alvesson (2004) argue that formal HRM procedures are not simply components of a bureaucratic structure, but rather articulate the interpretations, ideas and orientations of the managers and employees who exercise them. Based on this argument, it is claimed that entrepreneurship-based organizational control interacts with HRM procedures of measurement and feedback. The interplay between bureaucratic and entrepreneurship controls fosters IS employee identification with IESI.

*Managers as Carriers and Disseminators of Hi-Tech Related Discourse*

New IS Division mid-high managers, who have much previous professional experience in hi‑tech industry, seek to publicize and inaugurate a new hi-tech atmosphere by virtue of their symbolic power and high prestige. A work team manager describes these new managers as carriers of “a new spirit of innovation and improvement. Before they came,” he adds, “the prevailing attitude at אפריטיף was: ‘If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it!’”

Another team manager indicates that these new IS managers:

… have a hi-tech orientation and consequently realize that just because an employee was hired 20 years ago, it doesn’t necessarily make that employee suitable for the job today... You could help the employee find another position at אפריטיף, improve his performance, or fire him.

One new manager differentiates between the IS Division as a hi-tech entity and the remaining אפריטיף divisions as low-tech production plant components: “אפריטיף is a long-standing organization with many employees, with a lot of operation and maintenance employees... But, from my point of view as an IS Division manager, it [the IS Division] is a hi-tech division even if it is not officially defined as such.” According to this manager, the IS Division belongs to a hi‑tech cultural universe, while אפריטיף *per se* is still a low-tech industry. The conservative low-tech culture is perceived by these new managers as consistent with the established family-bureaucratic organizational control that still prevails at אפריטיף.

The new IS Division managers at אפריטיף identify with an external, cross-cutting professional group perceived as part of the hi-tech world. Feldman (1979) suggests that peer workgroups, departments and divisions form organizational “nested identities.” The hi-tech professionals at אפריטיף differ from their intracorporate peers by identifying with their perceived professional group rather than their organizational nested identities. One of these new managers refers to the emergent institutional logics of entrepreneurship as a “world culture” rather than a corporate culture:

I think that most of the principles [of corporate culture] are irrelevant, although they are correct in implying that all of us are part of a much broader culture. I cannot define what this broader culture is, but I know what I want it to be […]. This culture belongs to a world culture in which, as professionals, we have to assign responsibility and assume responsibility. I expect my subordinates to listen to me as I listen to them. I expect them to be available in case of malfunctions…

By “world culture,” this new manager refers to allocation and assumption of responsibility as markers of new ideas and practices of entrepreneurship and innovation that belong to hi-tech professional culture. It may be inferred that when this manager says: “I expect them to be available in case of malfunctions,” he contrasts hi-tech cultural values, such as taking initiative, with אפריטיף’s low-tech cultural values, such as obedience.

***IESI versus FMSI***

The following empirical data analysis compares three distinct characteristics of IESI with the those of the established FMSI. Identification of veteran and older employees is perceived by אפריטיף management as consistent with FMSI. Under the influence of the new ideas and practices of a professional group of recently-employed IS managers, however, IS employees are now expected to behave according to IESI principles. Thus, although IESI reflects the managers’ perceptions regarding the ideal IS employee, the preexisting FMSI reflects the managers’ perceptions of the typical one. Analysis of the two distinct attitudes will enable us to trace the emergent hi-tech related discourse of IESI.

*Generation Y versus Generation X*

The IESI is 20-35 years old, characterized by Gen-Y subculture: Well-educated, with academic degrees in electrical, electronic and/or computer engineering, highly motivated, with a strong sense of self-esteem and a deep awareness of one’s professional value and mobility opportunities in the hi-tech employment market. The IESI nurtures their ongoing professional development by continuously enriching and updating their specialized knowledge.

The FMSI is 40-60 years old, characterized by Gen-X subculture: Veteran employees who have tenure with אפריטיף, conservative attitudes and out-of-date technological capabilities. Consequently, FMSI employees are perceived as if they have high motivation and willingness to maintain their position at אפריטיף for as long a time as possible.

In the following quote, a work team manager differentiates between Gen-X and Gen-Y employees—again, between the ideal and typical IS employee:

אפריטיף is an excellent work place, but it is not attractive; you cannot choose a car or mobile phone. Many older employees have already worked here for twenty years and it is a problem to enlist and retain the people that you want, the best ones who will help us succeed and grow as a hi-tech division. Generation X employees can do routine jobs, while Generation Y employees require high maintenance. They need interesting work, positive feedback, bonuses, a good word from time to time and occasional perks. They are impatient; they do not accept “no” for an answer. They are in a hurry and they want to move forward as quickly as possible.

*Mind versus Sense: Professionalism versus Corporate-Oriented Commitment*

IESI calls for creativity. An IS employee is expected to suggest rational solutions and creative ways of handling daily professional issues or problems. The IESI outlines creative human beings who are expected to think about their role missions even outside work time or the workplace (Galia, 2016). As one employee indicates: “I go back home and think about how to solve problems, I [constantly] think about solutions. On my way to work [I usually receive] malfunction reports and [while driving to work] I think about what to do and how to solve them.”

The IESI has a robust commitment to a hi-tech professional group rather than to other associated intra-corporate groups (such as a team or department). Thus, the IESI professional commitment to the IS Division mission is mediated through a much broader imagined collective. On the IS Division level, IESIs are seemingly separate individuals, but on the professional peer group level, they are a collective, whose members have the same professional ethics. Kunda (1992) shows that above all, hi-tech engineers express commitment to their professional ethics rather than the ethics of the organization that employs them. Following Kunda (1992), the article contends that working for אפריטיף is considered by the IESI as a station on a path of professionalization, rather than a goal in itself. Membership in a professional group equips a person with a cosmopolitan sense, that in turn opens up worldwide job opportunities irrespective of concrete local organizations.

The FMSI is perceived as part of a unified collective with a robust commitment to family-based conventions. FMSI employees’ first priority is commitment to אפריטיף as a whole and their second is to identify with their respective functional organizational units. In such a collective atmosphere, they exhibit a powerful commitment to corporate conventions and beliefs rather than to any external SI with which they are associated. Consequently, FMSI employees pursue a long career trajectory at אפריטיף.

*The Depoliticized IESI versus the Politicized FMSI*

The IESI is not expected to engage in corporate politics, that is perceived as contrary to rationality. According to IS management perception, corporate politics can distract employees from their primary functional targets. In a turbulent and competitive environment, the IESI should concentrate merely on carrying out missions and initiatives efficiently and swiftly. The IESI’s orientation as a depoliticized human being is congruent with the meritocratic social mobility model, that conceptualizes people as individuals. Accordingly, political tactics such as intrigues, patronage or cooptation might possibly benefit unskilled employees rather than the more qualified ones.

The FMSI has a strong political sense of being a part of a cohesive collective. While the employee conforming to IESI principles is an individual who functions within an ostensibly rational-essentialist reality, reflecting the aggregate sum of rational individuals’ actions, the one who identifies with FMSI acts in a relational reality. Corporate politics is legitimized within reciprocal activities of participants, some of which are intended to strengthen and reproduce their power at the expense of others. Power relations form among interacting people and not among aggregated rational individuals. Thus, the more the employee is perceived as associated with a cohesive collective, whose members share a common value base, the more legitimate it is to exhibit practices of corporate politics.

**Discussion**

This article is based on exploratory research-based qualitative methods applied at an IS Division of an Israeli low-tech manufacturing plant. The article demonstrates top-down with a new IESI, bringing about dual organizational identification of EFM based on two competing types: IESI dispositions and preexisting FMSI family control. The IESI prototype is propounded by new mid-high managers at אפריטיף IS Department to influence IS employees’ identification. FMSI, in turn, reflects the original, family-based normative control that developed at אפריטיף under the influence of a varied and well-rooted employee welfare strategy.

Kärreman and Alvesson (2004) suggest that “the technocratic and socio-ideological layers of control do not so much complement or supplement, as feed upon and inform each other” (Kärreman & Alvesson, 2004, p.171). As such, it is maintained that entrepreneurship-based normative control interacts with increasing HRM procedures of measurement and feedback. Bureaucratic-entrepreneurship control thus fosters identification of IS employees with IESI. New managers at אפריטיף IS Division use their position of power, cultural capital and corporate materials to disseminate and translate the new hi-tech related discourse that underlie IESI. As such, these managers are predominant actors in the top-down identification process with IESI. Furthermore, their function as bearers and purveyors of hi-tech related institutional logics serves their instrumental aim to strengthen and preserve the power of the broader hi-tech professional group with which they are associated. Thus, we may assume that their bearers and purveyor function exists independently of any concrete corporation that employs them. As this article demonstrates, the emergent dispositions of IESI are congruent with the professional ethics of Generation Y: Creative, professional, proactive, responsible and depoliticized.

Most literature discusses dual identification from an epistemological perspective of positivism (Foreman & Whetten, 2002; Reade, 2001) rather than constructionism, without questioning the formation of dual identification in terms of power. By contrast, the present article suggests a power-based relational view that illustrates the construction of top-down EFM organizational identification. Accordingly, the article demonstrates and discusses top-down with IESI as a result of power-based relations between new mid-high IS managers—who possess symbolic and social power—and IS employees.

Finally, the article is based on exploratory research and as such on a limited data corpus. It suggests that further studies would explore the constitution of top-down EFM organizational identification on IS employees who work at low-tech manufacturing plants but are associated with hi-tech professional ethics that stress entrepreneurship.
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