

Guidelines and Criteria for the Submission of Short Papers at EGOS Colloquia

Short papers should focus on the main ideas of the later full paper, i.e. they should explain the purpose of the paper, theoretical background, the research gap that is addressed, the approach taken, the methods of analysis (in empirical papers), main findings and contributions. In addition, it is useful to indicate clearly how the paper links with the sub-theme and the overall theme of the Colloquium, although not all papers need to focus on the overall theme. Creativity, innovativeness, theoretical grounding and critical thinking are typical characteristics of EGOS papers.

Your short paper should comprise **around 3,000 words** (inc. references, appendices, and other material).

Submission deadline for short papers for the (main) 42nd EGOS online Colloquium hosted by the University of Bergamo, July 9–11, 2026:

- Tuesday, January 7, 2026, **12:00 CET**

The deadline is unchangeable and therefore **extensions can not be granted!**

Formatting your short paper

Your short paper should comprise **around 3,000 words**, according to the following format:

- Font: 12 pt, Arial or Times New Roman
- Margin left/right: 2.5 cm
- Line spacing: 1.5
- Use APA style for your citations

Do not use capital letters in your paper's title, unless they are proper nouns (e.g. "London", "Thomas"), quoted titles, or if it is the first word after a colon or hyphen. For example: *Mark Twain's "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn": Summary, analyses, and quotations*. Do not write your title in ALL CAPS.

Please **state your name** (and that of your co-author/s, if applicable) + affiliation + email at the top of your short paper (because no [single/double blind] peer review).

Short papers should be submitted as a **pdf or docx file**. Please do not upload txt files!



Steps prior to uploading your short paper

- To upload a short paper, you must be a **registered user** on the EGOS website.
If you have never been an EGOS member, never uploaded a short paper for one of the previous EGOS Colloquia, or never attended an EGOS Colloquium before, you need to **register on the EGOS website**. Click [here](#) and follow the instructions. Once you have an EGOS member number and password, please **log in to the member area “MyEGOS”** and follow the instructions for uploading your short paper listed below.
- If you are an active (or former) EGOS member, **log in to “MyEGOS”** using your email [or your EGOS member number] and your password.

Uploading your short paper

You can **only upload one short paper** with your EGOS member number! If your short paper is co-authored and you have already submitted a (single-authored) short paper to another sub-theme, then your co-author (one of your co-authors, respectively) has to upload this co-authored short paper by using their EGOS member number. Please note: You may only appear as **co-author in a maximum of TWO further short papers!**

- In the MyEGOS section of the website, click on **Submit your short paper**.
- Fill in the form.

Do not use ALL CAPS for your paper title.

As the uploader, you are the main author. Add all co-authors (can also be added when submitting your full paper).

Upload your paper as pdf or docx.

- If you want to re-upload your short paper because you submitted it to the wrong sub-theme or have an updated version, you can do so until the deadline:

In MyEGOS, you will see Status: Edit your short paper

Click delete your short paper application.

Submit your short paper again.

If you have any further questions, please contact the [EGOS Executive Secretariat](#).



Sub-theme 28: Environmental Ethics and More-than-Human Organizing



42nd EGOS
Colloquium
University of Bergamo
July 9–11, 2026
EGOS

Convenors:

Stephanie Daher

Grenoble École de Management & École Polytechnique, France
stephanie.daher@polytechnique.edu.fr

Irene Henriques

York University, Canada
ihenriques@schulich.yorku.ca

Gazi Islam

Grenoble Ecole de Management & IREGE, France
gazi.islam@grenoble-em.com

Call for Papers

Organizing sustainably raises complex ethical questions – particularly about how organizations relate to both natural and social environments. Yet ethical inquiries into such relations are complicated by the fact that ethical thought has often been conceived as a “human” science, primarily concerned with human beings and their interrelations (De Colle et al., 2024). In contrast, environmental ethics brings up questions of ethical duty, moral agency, and responsibility that cross species boundaries (Daher, 2024; Ergene & Calás, 2023), engaging what has come to be called *more-than-human relations* – those involving non-human entities such as animals, plants, ecosystems, and technologies, which may be ethically significant or agentic (Whatmore, 2002; Abram, 2012).

More-than-human ethical concerns may take the form of questions around human beings (and their organizations), responsibilities toward the natural environment and its geological systems (Böhm et al., 2022; Starik, 1995), or they may involve treating more-than-human entities as moral agents in their own right, asking questions about responsibility and ethical



relationality among entities beyond the human. Such considerations raise philosophical questions about the foundations of ethical thought (Kortetmäki et al., 2023), while also containing important organizational, economic and legal consequences. Expanding ethical thinking to more-than-human domains introduces new conceptual challenges, including the ethics of emerging or speculative beings, the moral considerations of possible futures, and meta-ethical questions about when and how ethical language is appropriate. It also introduces practical challenges around the responsibility for – and responsibility of – more-than-human beings, and how to organizing in ways that recognize the moral aspects of a broader array of entities.

Organizational and business ethics discussions are beginning to broach questions of environmental and more-than-human ethics (Dahlman, 2024; Ehrnström-Fuentes & Böhm, 2023; Ergene et al., 2024). While this literature is growing, it remains marginal to the core themes of the field. Much of business ethics – particularly normative work – continues to revolve around the “big three” conceptual frameworks of utilitarianism, deontology, and virtue ethics (Grant et al., 2017). However, emerging approaches such as the ethics of care (e.g., Beacham, 2018) and relational ethics (e.g., Pérezts et al., 2024) offer promising avenues for engaging more-than-human concerns. What new ethical theories or approaches might be particularly well-suited to examining the more-than-human? And how might these approaches build upon, extend, or challenge dominant currents in organizational ethics?

A second area of consideration is in the institutionalized distinction between descriptive and normative ethics, a core distinction in the field that has been both widely contested and remarkably resistant to change (Donaldson, 1994). Normative frameworks may offer criteria for evaluating environmental practices, yet they are often geared toward human goods and desires, limiting their applicability in more-than human contexts. Can we envision new normative approaches that allow more-than-human entities to participate in ethical worlds? Descriptive and empirical approaches, on the other hand, tend to focus on human impacts or interactions with non-human actors, such as technologies or ecosystems. But can descriptive ethics be reimaged to focus on more-than-human phenomena themselves? What would such a descriptive practice look like? And how might empirical methods such as interviews or ethnography account for agents that do not speak in conventional human language? Moreover, is the descriptive-normative distinction itself still adequate in an era where the boundaries between humans and their natural environments are increasingly blurred? Forms of ethical thinking that challenge or move beyond this binary may be especially valuable for theorizing environmental ethics in organizational contexts.

Finally, organizational ethics scholarship can benefit from direct theorizing and study of



organizations that seek to reshape their own relations with more-than-human entities. Social movements, ecologically conscious organizations, and technologically focused organizations may exhibit distinct ways of relating or framing the human and the more-than-human. Understanding these situated practices of organizing provides essential ground for new ethical theorizing. Modes of inquiry that emphasize collaborative inquiry, ethnographic immersion and theorization from the field are particularly valuable in these contexts where the view “from the ground” may be at the avant-garde of ethical innovation, and where theorists may have much to learn (both positively and critically) from actors in various kinds of organizations.

With the above considerations in mind, we invite contributions that engage with the following questions (among others):

- How does a focus on more-than-human entities change foundational questions of environmental ethics or ethical theory?
- How do foundational views of nature facilitate or inhibit ethical thinking? Is the concept “nature”, or the distinction “nature-culture” helpful to environmental ethics discussions?
- In what ways can more-than-human entities be considered moral agents, and what are the implications of expanded notions of moral agency for environmental ethics?
- How do discussions of ethics include more-than-human actors, and how does such inclusion challenge or complement how scholars think about ethics?
- How do environmental and more-than-human concerns challenge traditional distinctions between descriptive and normative ethics, and how does the descriptive-normative binary fare in an “Anthropocene” world where human actions shape geological realities?
- How do practice-oriented perspectives, including those of environmental activists, NGOs or public actors, provide opportunities for developing ideas about environmental ethics?
- What are the practical applications of ethics of care and connectedness (relational ethics) in business and environmental policies?
- How do worldviews outside of the Global North, including Indigenous perspectives on the natural environment, provide opportunities to develop new perspectives on environmental ethics and more-than human entities? How can Indigenous ethical perspectives be integrated into mainstream ethical frameworks to address global challenges like climate change?
- How do environmental ethics relate to social movements around gender, decolonization, racial justice, social class, and other ethically relevant social movements? What are the possibilities and limitations of intersections between ethical thinking across these areas?



- How do different organizational forms (e.g., cooperatives, B-corps, commons-based structures) facilitate or hinder ethical engagement with more-than-human entities?
- What does accountability look like in a world where organizational actions impact beings and systems beyond the human? Who speaks for the more-than-human, and how are such forms of representation ethically justified or critiqued?
- How do technologies such as AI, environmental sensors, or biotechnology mediate relationships between human and more-than-human actors in ethical terms? What are the ethical implications of organizations increasingly relying on non-human decision-makers or environmental data streams?

References

- Abram, D. (2012): *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-Than-Human World*. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Beacham, J. (2018): "Organising food differently: Towards a more-than-human ethics of care for the Anthropocene." *Organization*, 25 (4), 533–549.
- Böhm, S., Carrington, M., Cornelius, N., de Bruin, B., Greenwood, M., Hassan, L., Jain, T., Karam, C., Kourula, A., Romani, L., Riaz, S., & Shaw, D. (2022): "Ethics at the Centre of Global and Local Challenges: Thoughts on the Future of Business Ethics." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180 (3), 835–861.
- Daher, S. (2024): "Organizing at the End of the World: Ontological Perspectivism as an Approach to Ecological Crises." *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1, first published online on July 9, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMPROC.2024.14bp>.
- Dahlmann, F. (2025): "Conceptualising Sustainability as the Pursuit of Life." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 196, 499–521.
- De Colle, S., Freeman, R.E., & Wicks, A.C. (2024): "Toward humanistic business ethics." *Business & Society*, 63 (3), 542–571.
- Donaldson, T. (1994): "When integration fails: The logic of prescription and description in business ethics." *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 4 (2), 157–169.
- Ehrnström-Fuentes, M., & Böhm, S. (2023): "The Political Ontology of Corporate Social Responsibility: Obscuring the Pluriverse in Place." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 185 (2), 245–261.
- Ergene, S., Banerjee, S.B., & Hoffman, A.J. (2020): "(Un)Sustainability and Organization Studies: Towards a Radical Engagement." *Organization Studies*, 42(8), 1319–1335.
- Ergene, S., & Calás, M.B. (2023): "Becoming Naturecultural: Rethinking sustainability for a more-than-human world." *Organization Studies*, 44 (12), 1961–1986.
- Grant, P., Arjoon, S., & McGhee, P. (2017): "Reconciling Ethical Theory and Practice." *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, 36 (1), 41–65.
- Kortetmäki, T., Heikkinen, A., & Jokinen, A. (2023): "Particularizing Nonhuman Nature in Stakeholder Theory: The Recognition Approach." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 185 (1), 17–31.
- Pérezts, M., Fotaki, M., Shymko, Y., & Islam, G. (2024): "Breathe and let breathe: Breathing as a political model of organizing." *Organization*, 32 (1), 136–153.
- Starik, M. (1995): "Should trees have managerial standing? Toward stakeholder status for non-human nature." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14 (3), 207–217.
- Whatmore, S. (2002): *Hybrid Geographies: Natures Cultures Spaces*. London: SAGE Publications.

