

# 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 60: The Multispecies Turn: Challenges and Opportunities for Organizing beyond Anthropocentrism



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

## Convenors:

### Juan Pablo Casadiego

ESADE Business School, Spain

[juanpablo.casadiego@esade.edu](mailto:juanpablo.casadiego@esade.edu)

### Mike Zundel

University of Liverpool, United Kingdom

[M.Zundel@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:M.Zundel@liverpool.ac.uk)

### Rita Mota

ESADE Business School, Spain

[rita.mota@esade.edu](mailto:rita.mota@esade.edu)

---

## Call for Papers

---

Organizational studies have long overlooked non-human actors in mainstream research (Kandel et al., 2023; Tallberg et al., 2024). Characterized by anthropocentric thinking, this field has predominantly framed non-human actors as exploitable resources serving human ends, thereby neglecting their intrinsic value and moral worth as well as their wider role for human survival and flourishing. In stakeholder theory, for example, non-human animals (hereafter animals) or the sacredness of land typically find little voice next to concerns for human well-being (Labatut et al., 2016; Tallberg & Hamilton, 2022, Bastien et al., 2023). While there have been efforts to recognize non-human actors as more than mere resources, this recognition often remains constrained by human-centric values – such as the proposal to reimagine animals as “animal capital” (Sueur et al., 2024).

The case of animals is particularly puzzling, as they play vital roles as companions and kin, participating in our shared lifeworld and in the ecosystems we inhabit. We form emotional and relational bonds with animals whose behaviours we often see mimicking our own, from



play to the use of objects, as well as caring practices. Our daily interactions with certain animals, the cute puppy or kitten, the romantic pigeon display in the park, or the wild animals we see on television, stand in stark contrast with our perception of certain other animals, 'manufactured' as 'livestock' on industrial scales, or as 'pests', earmarked for efficient extinction. Given the historical connection between slaughterhouses and the development of techno-rational assembly lines as the basis for theories of organization (Burrell, 1997), we may be less surprised about the maintenance of these selective and contradictory aspects of human/non-human interactions, and how little we have investigated the societal and cultural norms, financial incentives, and institutional practices that commodify living beings, and the environment writ large.

There have, however, been recent research calls for eco-centric organizing that harmonically reconnects humans with nature and other "living beings as inherently worthy, regardless of their instrumental utility to humans, while respecting the intrinsic values of richness and ecological diversity" (Muñoz & Branzei, 2020, p. 508). This viewpoint encourages a fundamental shift in organizational purpose, transitioning from a focus on human superiority and systems of exploitation, to one rooted in reciprocity, compassion, inclusivity, and justice for multiple species and other non-human actors. According to Tallberg and colleagues (2024), "multispecies inclusivity can spark societal innovations benefiting both humans and animals, fostering more compassionate, resilient, and sustainable societies for all life" (p. 4). However, despite some theoretical advancements in advocacy for non-human voices in organizational processes (Thomsen et al., 2024), there is a lack of empirical work demonstrating how to reconfigure human-animal relations within organizational contexts (Doré & Michalon, 2017; Tallberg et al., 2024).

Against this background, this sub-theme aims to investigate alternative methods of organizing that transcend human-centered perspectives and promote inclusivity across multiple species and wider spectrums of non-human actors. It invites critical examinations of how organizations can reshape and shift structures of power, value creation activities, and value systems as they cultivate ethical, harm-free, and mutually beneficial relationships with non-human actors. This sub-theme also encourages innovative methodological, epistemological, and ontological approaches to reconsider the role of non-human life forms in organizational processes. Hence, it highlights non-human actors' agency and active participation in life-supporting dynamics, rather than viewing them merely as resources. This perspective emphasizes the interconnected realms of meaning, value, and mutual reliance among all life forms. Against this broad background, we can see particular value in discussions around the 'multispecies turn' and ethical and ecological challenges.



## **The multispecies turn: A challenge to anthropocentric frameworks**

The multispecies turn (Fitz-Henry, 2021) highlights the interconnectedness of humans and non-human species, challenging the anthropocentric frameworks that dominate organizational studies. While this shift has gained momentum in environmental politics, where animal and ecosystem rights are increasingly discussed (Celermajer et al., 2022), it remains largely absent from organizational theory that has been built around human stakeholders (Kortetmäki et al., 2022). Organizations, whether economic, social, or cultural, are typically understood to exist to serve humans; as a result, non-human animals are often reduced to mere commodities. This neglect fails to consider animals' intrinsic value, emotional capacities, and ability to suffer, and it denies more complex ecological patterns integral to human survival, being an inherent part of a flourishing world.

Expanding the ethical scope of organizational studies to include multispecies inclusivity is, therefore, not only an academic exercise but a moral imperative. For example, animal agriculture – a major contributor to deforestation, greenhouse gas emissions, and biodiversity loss – illustrates the intersection of human, planetary, and animal suffering (Alexander et al., 2015; Hayek & Miller, 2021). An anthropocentric approach might prioritize mitigating environmental impacts solely for human benefit, neglecting the billions of animals subjected to structural exploitation. In this context, it is important to consider the contributions made by humanities scholars who, for decades, have debated multispecies relationships, ecological organization, and interspecies justice through critical ecofeminist (Irni et al., 2023; Haraway, 2010; Lugones, 2010) and decolonial lenses (Belcourt, 2015).

### **Ethical and ecological challenges: Exploring contested areas**

Sustainable organizing encompasses contested areas related to multispecies inclusivity (Fitzgerald, 2018), one of which is regeneration. Proponents of regenerative agriculture argue that integrating livestock into regenerative systems can enhance ecosystem restoration through practices such as grazing and soil improvement. However, mounting evidence calls into question the sustainability and scalability of these approaches in light of climate change (Garnett et al., 2017). Additionally, ethical considerations surrounding the use of animals within regenerative systems are often neglected. Wies and Ellis (2020) advocate for symbiotic relationships in food production that avoid coercion, suffering, or death, thereby challenging traditional regenerative practices.

Multispecies inclusivity also poses challenges to environmental governance, particularly when differing values, priorities, and perspectives regarding human and non-human animals



intersect in decision-making processes. Historically, governance systems have treated humans as the primary decision-makers, viewing non-human animals as passive resources to be managed. In contrast, a multispecies perspective recognizes non-human animals as active agents, co-creators of the ecosystem, who engage meaningfully with their environment rather than remaining commodified as passive entities. Can we envision regenerative organizations and governance systems that prioritize harm-free interspecies interactions and non-human animals' well-being?

## **Learning from philosophical, spiritual, and post-humanistic perspectives**

To deepen multispecies integrity, organizational studies can draw on a variety of philosophical, spiritual, and post-humanistic perspectives (Delmestri & Schneeberger, 2022; Tallberg & Huopalaainen, 2024). Western, anthropocentric epistemologies have historically marginalized views that emphasize interconnectedness with nonhuman life. We invite contributions that suggest alternative philosophies and explore their use for multispecies inclusivity. Animism, pantheism, and Indigenous cosmologies, for example, offer profound insights into relational ways of organizing based on diverse lifeworlds (see, for example, the concept of *Umwelt* introduced by Jakob von Uexküll), while phenomenological anthropology shows how hunter-gatherers remain connected to the earth, grounded within their perceptual surround (Ingold, 2011). Such studies suggest, more broadly, that attending to differences in multispecies forms of being-in-the-world involves differing semiotic modalities that remain irreducible to the human apparatus of representation and thus require also new 'multi-modal' methods and repertoires to give voice to what Kohn (2013) calls the "open whole" of non-human symbolism.

Outside of the canon of Western science, we find rich sources for new sensibilities. Ahimsa, for example, is a core principle in Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism, advocates nonviolence toward all living beings, aligning closely with the ideals of harm-free organizing. Similarly, veganism picks up various philosophical strands under the ethical imperative of rejecting animal exploitation for human benefit. How might such spiritual and philosophical modes of thinking help us question commonly accepted meanings and allow us to perceive the world in a new way (Tsoukas et al., 2024), for instance as a communion of human and non-human subjects (Berry, 2010)? How can they inspire and support organizational research and practice that promote multispecies justice and sustainability efforts?

## **Critical questions for reaching multispecies inclusivity**

In this sub-theme, we aim to collaboratively imagine an interspecies "good life for all" from a



distinctly organizational studies perspective, and we are particularly interested in the adoption and transition towards new perspectives in organizing. This involves examining questions that include, but are not restricted to, the following:

- How can organizational studies address power imbalances between species and recognize the agency and emotional capacities of non-human animals (Meijer, 2023)?
- What drives and hinders the adoption of perspectives that foster multispecies inclusivity and integrity in organizing?
- Is the consideration of non-human animals reconcilable with existing organizational frameworks, or does it require radical change? Then, what are the potential conflicts and synergies between a multispecies perspective and other approaches to organizing?
- What theoretical and methodological innovations are needed to understand and transform human-animal interactions and sharing agency across species in organizational contexts?
- How can we integrate spiritual and post-humanistic perspectives to foster multispecies inclusivity and integrity?
- What role do organizations and educational institutions play in fostering multispecies organizing grounded in ethical principles of harm-free, care, and mutualism?
- How should we think about the ethics of human-technology complexes ('cyborgs'), for instance, when considering distributed cognition or the outsourcing of memories to technological devices?

We invite empirical, conceptual, and methodological contributions exploring non-human life in organizational contexts from diverse disciplines, such as organization science, management, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and economics. Contributions from fields such as critical feminism, queer studies, and environmental ethics, as well as more performative approaches, are equally welcome as we work toward reimagining organizations for a more inclusive, just, ethical, and regenerative future.

In addition to conventional paper submissions, we aspire to organize activities during the conference that emphasize creativity, embodiment, and group participation. These might include roundtable discussions, dialogical sessions, debates, talks by activists, or artistic contributions like film screenings, storytelling, or sensory walks (we are open to suggestions). Through these initiatives, we seek to establish a space for collaborative exploration of diverse approaches to our engagement with more-than-human actors.



---

## References

---

- Alexander, P., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Dislich, C., Dodson, J.R., Engström, K., & Moran, D. (2015): "Drivers for global agricultural land use change: The nexus of diet, population, yield and bioenergy." *Global Environmental Change*, 35, 138–147.
- Bastien, F., Coraiola, D.M., & Foster, W.M. (2023): "Indigenous Peoples and Organization Studies." *Organization Studies*, 44 (4), 659–675.
- Belcourt, B.R. (2015): "Animal bodies, colonial subjects:(Re) locating animality in decolonial thought." *Societies*, 5 (1), 1–11.
- Berry, T. (2010): *Evening Thoughts: Reflecting on Earth as a Sacred Community*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Burrell, G. (1997): *Pandemonium: Towards a Retro-Organization Theory*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Celermajer, D., Schlosberg, D., Rickards, L., Stewart-Harawira, M., Thaler, M., Tschakert, P., Verlie, B., & Winter, C. (2022): "Introduction: Multispecies justice: theories, challenges, and a research agenda for environmental politics." In: G. Hayes, S. Jinnah, P. Kashwan, D.M. Konisky, S. Macgregor, J.M. Meyer, & A.R. Zito (eds.): *Trajectories in Environmental Politics*. London, Routledge.
- Charles, N., Fox, R., Miele, M., & Smith, H. (2024): "De-centring the human: Multi-species research as embodied practice." *The Sociological Review*, 72 (6), 1335–1354.
- Delmestri, G., & Schneeberger, D. (2022): "Organizational Change and Work Spirituality: Expanding the Moral Circle." In: Y. Altman, J. Neal, & W. Mayrhofer (eds.): *Workplace Spirituality: Making a Difference*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 95–110.
- Doré, A., & Michalon, J. (2017): "What makes human–animal relations 'organizational'? The de-scription of anthrozootechnical agencements." *Organization*, 24 (6), 761–780.
- Fitzgerald, A.J. (2019): *Animal Advocacy and Environmentalism: Understanding and Bridging the Divide*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Fitz-Henry, E. (2021): "Multi-species justice: A view from the rights of nature movement." *Environmental Politics*, 31 (2), 338–359.
- Garnett, T., Godde, C., Muller, A., Rööös, E., Smith, P., de Boer, I.J.M., zu Ermgassen, E., Herrero, M., van Middelaar, C.E., Schader, C., & van Zanten, H.H.E. van (2017): *Grazed and confused? Ruminating on cattle, grazing systems, methane, nitrous oxide, the soil carbon sequestration question*. Oxford, UK: Food Climate Research Network, <https://www.leap.ox.ac.uk/article/grazed-and-confused-ruminating-cattle-grazing-systems-methane-nitrous-oxide-soil-carbon-sequ>.
- Haraway, D. (2010): "When species meet: Staying with the trouble." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(1), 53–55.
- Hayek, M.N., & Miller, S.M. (2021): "Underestimates of methane from intensively raised animals could undermine goals of sustainable development." *Environmental Research Letters*, 16 (6), <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac02ef>.
- Ingold, T. (2011): *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. London: Routledge.
- Irni, K., Aavik, K., & Joki, M.-M. (2023): "Introduction: Critical Feminist Animal and Multispecies Studies." In: K. Aavik, K. Irni, & M.-M. Joki (eds.): *Feminist Animal and Multispecies Studies: Critical Perspectives on Food and Eating*. Leiden: Brill, 1–41.
- Kandel, I.J., Dlouhy, K., & Schmitt, A. (2023): "Animal roles in organizations: A framework for exploring organizational human–animal relations." *Organization*, 32 (4), 508–526.
- Kohn, E. (2013): *How Forests Think: Toward an Anthropology Beyond the Human*. Berkeley: California University Press.
- Kortetmäki, T., Heikkinen, A., & Jokinen, A. (2022): "Particularizing nonhuman nature in stakeholder theory: The recognition approach." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 185(1), 17–31.
- Labatut, J., Munro, I., & Desmond, J. (2016): "Animals and organizations." *Organization*, 23 (3), 315–329.
- Lugones, M. (2010): "Toward a decolonial feminism." *Hypatia*, 25 (4), 742–759.
- Meijer, E. (2023): "Global injustice and animals: Towards a multispecies social connection model." *International Relations*, 37 (3), 497–513.
- Muñoz, P., & Branzei, O. (2021): "Regenerative Organizations: Introduction to the Special Issue." *Organization & Environment*, 34 (4), 507–516.



- Sueur, C., Fourneret, É., & Espinosa, R. (2024): "Animal capital: a new way to define human-animal bond in view of global changes and food insecurity." *npj Sustainable Agriculture*, 2 (1), <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44264-024-00030-4>.
- Tallberg, L., García-Rosell, J.-C., & Haanpää, M. (2021): "Human-animal relations in business and society: Advancing the feminist interpretation of stakeholder theory." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180 (1), 1–16.
- Tallberg, L., & Hamilton, L. (2022): *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Organization Studies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tallberg, L., & Huopainen, A. (2024): "We are the missing people. On posthumanist onto-epistemologies in organization studies." In: F.-X. de Vaujany, S. Gherardi, & P. Silva (eds.): *Organization Studies and Posthumanism*. London, Routledge, 29–52.
- Tallberg, L., Huopainen, A., & García-Rosell, J.-C. (2024): "Beyond Anthropocentrism: A Call to Action for Multispecies Inclusivity." *Business & Society*, 64 (7), 1263–1268.
- Thomsen, B., Vassallo, J., Wright, C., Chen, S., Thomsen, J., Villar, D., Gosler, A., Best, T., Deshwal, A., Coose, S., Such, R., Huikuri, S., Fennell, S.R., Hincapié, M.A., Winfrey, D., Mirin, B.H., Pekrul, A., Riley, E., & Muurlink, O. (2024): "Reimagining entrepreneurship in the Anthropocene through a multispecies relations approach." *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 22, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2024.e00507>.
- Tsoukas, H., Sandberg, J., Fayard, A.-L., & Zundel, M. (2024): "Introduction to the Special Issue on Philosophy and Organization Studies: How Does Philosophy Illuminate the Study of Organizations?" *Organization Studies*, 45 (9), 1229–1251.
- Weis, T., & Ellis, R.A. (2020): "Animal functionality and interspecies relations in regenerative agriculture: considering necessity and the possibilities of non-violence." In: J. Duncan, M. Carolan, & J.S.C. Wiskerke (eds.): *Routledge Handbook of Sustainable and Regenerative Food Systems*. London: Routledge, 141–153.

