

# 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) 42<sup>nd</sup> 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 30: From the Margins to the Mainstream: The Role of Contestation, Competition, and Agency in the Evolution of Novelty



42<sup>nd</sup> EGOS  
Colloquium  
University of Bergamo  
July 9–11, 2026  
EGOS

## Convenors:

### Ibrat Djabbarov

Imperial College London, United Kingdom  
[i.djabbarov@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:i.djabbarov@imperial.ac.uk)

### Gino Cattani

New York University, USA  
[gc59@stern.nyu.edu](mailto:gc59@stern.nyu.edu)

### Denise Falchetti

George Washington University, USA  
[dfalchetti@gwu.edu](mailto:dfalchetti@gwu.edu)

---

## Call for Papers

---

In this sub-theme, we will explore how contestation, competition, and conflict shape the evolution of novel technologies, categories, and practices as they transition from the margins to the mainstream. Novel ideas, particularly in their early stages, often lack legitimacy and occupy low-status positions within their fields (Navis & Glynn, 2011; Aldrich & Fiol, 1994). Understanding how these novel forms emerge on the periphery and evolve into mainstream phenomena remains a critical area of inquiry in organization studies (Zietsma et al., 2017).

The introduction of novel technologies, categories, and practices by peripheral actors, who are more likely to initiate change and innovate (Leblebici et al., 1991; Cattani & Ferriani, 2008; Cattani et al., 2017; Zietsma et al., 2017), disrupts established norms, often provoking pushback from incumbents who benefit from maintaining the status quo actively defend existing arrangements by leveraging their resources, regulatory influence, and legitimized positions (Hardy & Maguire, 2010; Reay & Hinings, 2005). The incumbents' counteractions,



such as delegitimizing novel categories, imposing regulatory constraints, or influencing established norms, can weaken the innovators' position (Durand & Khaire, 2017; Wry et al., 2011). While such pushback can hinder the adoption of novelty, it can also create opportunities for refinement and legitimation, accelerating its transition to broader acceptance (Cattani et al., 2017; Garud et al., 2014). This alignment often involves framing strategies that resonate with institutional norms or cultural values (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014; Glynn & Navis, 2013). Indeed, innovators – particularly peripheral ones – must engage in a translation process (Harman & Dietrich, 2013) to articulate their ideas in the language spoken by the custodians of existing practices.

Structural challenges further complicate the journey of novel forms. These include regulatory hurdles, institutional inertia, and the dominance of legitimized practices (Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006). Mature fields are shaped by arrangements that privilege incumbents, making it difficult for emerging innovations to gain traction (Fligstein & McAdam, 2012). Addressing these challenges requires institutional entrepreneurship, where actors seek to reshape field structures and norms to accommodate novel categories (Battilana et al., 2009; Hardy & Maguire, 2008). At the same time, institutional pressures often prompt innovators to adapt their practices and narratives, aligning them more closely with dominant logic to gain acceptance (Ansari et al., 2016; Cornelissen & Werner, 2014). Competition introduces another dynamic layer to the evolution of novelty. Incumbents frequently leverage their resources, legitimacy, and established networks to outcompete emerging alternatives, shaping the trajectory of novel forms (Hargadon & Douglas, 2001; Zuckerman, 1999). However, competing alternatives also arise among peripheral actors, particularly in emerging technologies or nascent markets, where resource constraints and audience fragmentation intensify rivalry (Garud et al., 2014). This interplay between rivalries – from incumbents and peers – influences whether novel ideas achieve mainstream adoption or remain marginal (Cattani et al., 2017).

Despite these hurdles, contestation, challenges, and competition often foster innovation. Contestation compels innovators to refine their narratives and engage in translation processes that resonate with stakeholders (Harman & Dietrich, 2013; Ansari et al., 2016). Challenges inspire creative problem-solving, leading to reconfigurations that enhance feasibility and acceptance (Hargadon & Douglas, 2001; Greenwood & Suddaby, 2006). Competition drives differentiation and experimentation, pushing innovators to develop strategies that position their ideas more effectively. Together, these forces shape the trajectory of novelty, determining whether it transitions into the mainstream or remains on the margins (Garud et al., 2014; Cattani et al., 2017).

Some hurdles are relaxed or disappear when disruptive events such as exogenous shocks



(e.g., natural disasters, pandemics, wars, or regulatory changes) dramatically alter the status quo (Fligstein & McAdam 2012). By challenging existing arrangements, these shocks often force all actors to adapt or risk obsolescence. For peripheral actors, these moments of upheaval may represent a unique opportunity to further their innovations as they help create a more receptive social space where those innovations are more likely to receive support and recognition from relevant audiences (Sine & David, 2003; Ansari & Krop, 2012; Cattani et al., 2017; Corbo et al., 2024).

The contemporary presence of multiple interested audiences (or stakeholders) also allows for the coexistence of different perspectives. Discrepancies in expectations across multiple audiences can create opportunities for innovators to select niches in which they can satisfy one set of expectations while being shielded, at least temporarily, from alternative expectations (Aldrich & Martinez, 2015; Cattani et al., 2017). One might even argue that the presence of multiple audiences, combined with changes in their membership, expands the number of possible destination states of the legitimation journey of novelty. This reflects what sociologists of science describe as a “non-determined, multidirectional flux” (Bijker et al., 1987, p. 13).

This sub-theme seeks to advance scholarly understanding of how contestation, challenges, and competition influence the evolution of novel ideas, categories, and practices. We invite submissions exploring how different actors’ responses to novelty – whether through resistance, adaptation, or competition – shape the trajectory of organizational and field dynamics. We welcome theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary contributions that illuminate the role of these forces in redirecting the emergence and evolution of novelty. We encourage submissions that draw on a range of theories, settings, and levels of analysis to explore these themes. To this end, we solicit submissions addressing the following or similar questions:

- How do incumbents contest novelty and affect its evolution?
- How do novel forms evolve because of institutional pressures or other structural challenges?
- How do creators or promoters of novel forms respond to the contests over time?
- How do entrepreneurial narratives evolve during the different phases of a novel idea journey?
- How do exogenous shocks influence the journey of peripheral actors toward mainstream acceptance?
- How do exogenous shocks alter the expectations of key stakeholders who control critical symbolic and/or material resources?



- How does audience heterogeneity affect the likelihood of peripheral actors' success?
- How do challengers' framing strategies evolve within contested organizational fields?

---

## References

---

- Aldrich, H.E., & Fiol, C.M. (1994): 2Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (4), 645–670.
- Aldrich, H.E., & Martinez, M. (2015): "Why aren't entrepreneurs more creative? Conditions affecting creativity and innovation in entrepreneurial activity." In: C. Shalley, M. Hitt, & J. Zhou (eds.): *Oxford Handbook of Creativity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship: Multilevel Linkages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 445–456.
- Ansari, S.S., Garud, R., & Kumaraswamy, A. (2016): "The disruptor's dilemma: TiVo and the U.S. television ecosystem." *Strategic Management Journal*, 37 (9), 1829–1853.
- Ansari, S.S., & Krop, P. (2012): "Incumbent performance in the face of a radical innovation: Towards a framework for incumbent challenger dynamics." *Research Policy*, 41 (8), 1357–1374.
- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009): "How actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship." *Academy of Management Annals*, 3 (1), 65–107.
- Bijker, W.E., Parke Hughes, T., & Pinch, T.J. (1987): *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cattani, G., & Ferriani, S. (2008): "A core/periphery perspective on individual creative performance: Social networks and cinematic achievements in the Hollywood film industry." *Organization Science*, 19 (6), 824–844.
- Cattani, G., Ferriani, S., & Lanza, A. (2017): "Deconstructing the outsider puzzle: The legitimation journey of novelty." *Organization Science*, 28 (6), 965–992.
- Cornelissen, J.P., & Werner, M.D. (2014): "Putting framing in perspective: A review of framing and frame analysis across the management and organizational literature." *Academy of Management Annals*, 8 (1), 181–235.
- Corbo, L., Corrado, R., & Ferriani, S. (2024): "Network pathways of peripheral firm entry: Empirical evidence from the global airline industry." *Research Policy*, 53 (4), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2024.104960>.
- Durand, R., & Khaire, M. (2017): "Where do market categories come from and how? Distinguishing category creation from category emergence." *Journal of Management Studies*, 54 (5), 845–872.
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012): *A Theory of Fields*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garud, R., Gehman, J., & Giuliani, A.P. (2014): "Contextualizing entrepreneurial innovation: A narrative perspective." *Research Policy*, 43 (7), 1177–1188.
- Greenwood, R., & Suddaby, R. (2006): "Institutional entrepreneurship in mature fields: The Big Five accounting firms." *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (1), 27–48.
- Glynn, M.A., & Navis, C. (2013): "Categories, identities, and cultural classification: Moving beyond a model of categorical constraint." *Journal of Management Studies*, 50 (6), 1124–1137.
- Hargadon, A., & Douglas, Y. (2001): "When innovations meet institutions: Edison and the design of the electric light." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46 (3), 476–501.
- Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2008): "Institutional entrepreneurship." In: R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (eds.): *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. London: SAGE Publications, 198–217.
- Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2010): "Discourse, field-configuring events, and change in organizations and institutional fields: Narratives of deinstitutionalization." *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (6), 1365–1392.



- Leblebici, H., Salancik, G.R., Copay, A., & King, T. (1991): "Institutional change and the transformation of interorganizational fields: An organizational history of the U.S. radio broadcasting industry." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36 (3), 333–363.
- Navis, C., & Glynn, M.A. (2011): "Legitimate distinctiveness and the entrepreneurial identity: Influence on investor judgments of new venture plausibility." *Academy of Management Review*, 36 (3), 479–499.
- Rao, H., Morrill, C., & Zald, M.N. (2000): "Power plays: How social movements and collective action create new organizational forms." *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 239–282.
- Reay, T., & Hinings, C.R. (2005): "The recomposition of an organizational field: Health care in Alberta." *Organization Studies*, 26 (3), 351–384.
- Sine, W.D., & David, R.J. (2003): "Environmental jolts, institutional change, and the creation of entrepreneurial opportunity in the US electric power industry." *Research Policy*, 32 (2), 185–207.
- Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M.A. (2011): "Legitimizing nascent collective identities: Coordinating cultural entrepreneurship." *Organization Science*, 22 (2), 449–463.
- Zietsma, C., Groenewegen, P., Logue, D.M., & Hinings, C.R. (2017): "Field or fields? Building the scaffolding for cumulation of research on institutional fields." *Academy of Management Annals*, 11 (1), 391–450.
- Zuckerman, E.W. (1999): "The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount." *American Journal of Sociology*, 104 (5), 1398–1438.

