

## Call for papers



## Legitimation of Newness and EU Agenda for Change

### LNETN Conference

June 22-24, 2023

Aalborg University Copenhagen

[www.tbrp.aau.dk/lnetn/network-training/conference](http://www.tbrp.aau.dk/lnetn/network-training/conference)

We live in ‘liquid’ times (Bauman 2007) that raise challenges, liquid states, never encountered before. This is exemplified in the UN Sustainable Development Goals ‘which are an urgent call for action’ to the challenges of a volatile world. We witness—and unfortunately often ‘turn a blind eye’ on—interrelated, mutually reinforcing ‘liquid states’, in:

- *Politics*: Brexit; Protectionism; Anti-globalism, De-globalization and late globalization (Turcan 2016; Turcan et al. 2020); Slowbalization (The Economist, 2019); Populism (Turcan & Reilly, 2020);
- *Science and technology*: Genetically modified crops; Nuclear energy; Fracking; Global warming; AI; Big Data; Block Chain; G6; IoT;
- *Health*: Eating disorders; Immunization and anti-vaccine;
- *Social*: Mass migration; Extremism; Terrorism; Nationalism; Chauvinism; Sovereignty;
- *Ethics*: Astroturfing (Lee, 2010); Fake news; Post truth politics; Science denial; Higher Education internationalization (Turcan et al., 2021).

What these ‘liquid’ states have in common is a high degree of (i) newness, (ii) innovative power, and (iii) negative social impact. Individually or collectively, they singularly affect the ‘free will’. Newness brings with it: uncertainty, defined as “any lack of sure knowledge about the course of past, present, future, or hypothetical events” (Downs 1957, p. 77); ignorance, that is socially constructed (Smithson 1985) and manifests in the absence of true knowledge and/or when the latter is distorted (Moore and Tumin 1949); and fear, “...a sense of impotence that we are no longer in control, whether singly, severally or collectively” (Bauman 2007:26) and, reinforced by ignorance, a sense that we have limited freedom to choose.

The problem this conference aim to address is defined by the paradox of newness under uncertainty in various contexts. On one side, newness under uncertainty has a high potential – and usually it does - for high innovative power. On the other, newness has a high potential – and usually it does – for a negative social impact. During such liquid times and states, an alternative legitimation is urgently needed (Bauman,

2007) to understand how new and uncertain reality is socially constructed, de-constructed, and re-constructed at all levels: micro, meso, macro, and meta.

Hence the central thesis this conference adopts to mitigate the paradox of newness is that (the emergence of) newness shall be underpinned by legitimacy building or legitimation of newness alongside other enabling factors and actions at all levels: micro, meso, macro, and meta.

We invite submissions for five research themes:

- Legitimation of new institutions and policies (Track 1)
- Legitimation of new industries and ventures (Track 2)
- Legitimation of new organizing forms and practices (Track 3)
- Legitimation of newness in traditional and modern contexts (Track 4)
- Legitimation of new behaviours (Track 5)

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2007. *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Lee, Caroline W. 2010. The Roots of Astroturfing. *Contexts* 9 (1): 75–77.

Moore, Wilbert E., and Melvin M. Tumin. 1949. Some Social Functions of Ignorance. *American Sociological Review* 14 (6): 787–795.

Slowbalisation. 2019. *The Economist*, January 24.

Smithson, M. 1985. Toward a Social Theory of Ignorance. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 15 (2): 151–172.

Turcan, R. V. (2016). Exploring Late Globalization: A Viewpoint. *Markets, Globalization & Development Review* 1 (2): 4.

Turcan, R. V. and Reilly, J. E. (Eds.) (2020). *Populism and Higher Education Curriculum Development: Problem Based Learning as a Mitigating Response*. Palgrave Macmillan

Turcan, R. V., Boujarzadeh, B. and Dholakia, N. (2020). Late Globalization and Evolution, Episodes and Epochs of Industries: Evidence from Danish Textile and Fashion Industry, 1945–2015. *Thunderbird International Business Review* 62: 515–530.

Turcan, R., Juho, A., & Reilly, J. (2021). Advanced Structural Internationalization of Universities is Unethical. *Organization*, 28(6), 1059-1067.

## Track1: Legitimation of new institutions and policies

**Track chairs:** Svante Andersson and Natasha Evers

The profound differences in institutional frameworks between emerging economies and developed economies force scholars to pay more attention to these differences in addition to considering industry-based and resource-based factors (Peng et al 2009). International growth entails adaptation and compliance with national legislation and standards often in different, contrasting institutional contexts. Institutional requirements (national and international) and cultural expectations legislation and standards will influence a firm's behaviour and strategy (North, 1990; Peng, 2003; Peng et al., 2009; Scott, 1995; Turcan et al., 2022).

This track invites innovative, impact-oriented submissions that explore how to achieve legitimacy in international markets (Evers & Andersson, 2021). The submissions should consider organizations of different size and age. International new ventures, which, soon after inception, aim for international markets must deal with the legitimation of newness (Stinchcombe, 1965), foreignness (Zaheer, 1995), and smallness (Aldrich & Auster, 1986). Older firms may have more resources and power, but still need to deal with legitimation in a foreign context when they enter a new international market. In both cases, the firm has to legitimate its strategy to existing stakeholders.

Consistent within this, the submissions will explore how new institutions and policies shape and are shaped by innovations, new technologies and international new ventures, how new business-policy relationships are created, emerge and are legitimated, and how different approaches taken by international new ventures in different contexts (e.g., life-sciences, social entrepreneurship, gambling, vertical farming, non-for-profit) help understand how legitimacy is conferred, obtained and even lost amongst new industries and international new ventures and emerging polity. Case studies should relate empirical findings to the development of theory and should be impact oriented.

Aldrich, H., & Auster, E. R. (1986). Even dwarfs started small: Liabilities of age and size and their strategic implications. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 165–198.

Deephouse, D.L., Bundy, J., Tost, L.P. and Suchman, M.C. (2017), "Organizational legitimacy: six key questions", in Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T. and Meyer, R. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, 2nd ed., Sage, London, pp. 27-52.

Evers, N. & Andersson, S. (2021). Predictive and effectual decision-making in high-tech international new ventures: A matter of sequential ambidexterity. *International Business Review*. Vol. 30, No. 1, 101655

North, D.C. (1990), *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Peng, M. (2003), "Institutional transitions and strategic choices", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 492–528.

Peng, M.W., Sun, S.L. and Chen, H. (2009), "The institution-based view as a third leg for a strategy tripod", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 63-81.

Scott, W. (1995), *Institutions and Organizations*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Social structure and organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations* (pp. 142–193). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.

Turcan, R., Juho, A., & Reilly, J. (2021). Advanced Structural Internationalization of Universities is Unethical. *Organization*, 28(6), 1059-1067.

Zaheer, S., 1995. Overcoming the liability of foreignness. *Academy of Management Journal* 38, 341–363.

## Track 2: Legitimation of new industries and ventures

**Track chairs:** Jillian Gordon and Niall MacKenzie

The principal focus is to understand how legitimation drives innovation and the legitimation processes and interactions of new industries and ventures. In particular we welcome work on the bio-economy, Internet of Things, FinTech, and energy (broadly defined) that explores how these new industries and ventures gain legitimation in society.

Research that explores micro, meso, and macro levels of legitimation in relation to individuals, organisations, and institutions including analyses of technology, business, systems, and society will be positively considered.

Existing work on entrepreneurship that considers the importance of context in understanding how new organisations, ideas, technologies, processes, and businesses start up (Welter, 2011) and how the legitimation process unfolds (Turcan and Fraser, 2016) and on how legitimation works (Suchman, 1995; Stinchcombe, 1965) underpin the rationale for this session. This may include work that demonstrates subversion of or conformance to laws, regulations, social norms, societal values, and cultural cognitive frameworks (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Scott, 2001).

We welcome research exploring legitimation that is novel, deploying innovative (and traditional) methodologies and/or that is set in interesting contexts. Similarly, historical (Suddaby et al, 2020) and/or contemporary analyses, case studies, phenomenological, and theory driven submissions are welcome.

DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. (1983). "The iron cage revisited: Collective rationality and institutional isomorphism in organizational fields," *American Sociological Review* 48, no.2 (1983): 147-160.  
Scott, W.R. 2001. *Institutions and Organizations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.  
Stinchcombe, A. (1965). Organization-creating organizations. *Society*, 2(2), pp.34-35.  
Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.  
Suddaby, R., Coraiola, D., Harvey, C., & Foster, W. (2020). History and the micro-foundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(3), 530-556.  
Turcan, R. V., & Fraser, N. (2016). An Ethnographic Study of New Venture and New Sector Legitimation: Evidence from Moldova. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 11(1), 72 - 88.  
Welter, F., 2011. Contextualizing entrepreneurship—conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), pp.165-184.



### Track 3: Legitimation of new organizing forms and practices

**Track chair:** Petri Ahokangas and Timo Koivumaki

New business models disrupt businesses and business ecosystems and bring challenges of legitimacy and legitimation to firms and industries of all sizes (Schiavi & Behr, 2018). Legitimation and legitimacy of new business models have traditionally been approached at the level of individual firms (Biloslavo, Bagnoli, Massaro, & Cosentino, 2020; Lanzolla & Markides, 2021; Turcan, 2020). Recently, the business model as a boundary-spanning unit of analysis (Zott, Amit, & Massa, 2011) has evolved from firm-centric to ecosystem embedded, extending the scope of business model innovation to cover ecosystem innovation (Press, Robert, & Maillefert, 2020; Snihur & Bocken, 2022; Thomas & Ritala, 2022). Business models, utilizing platforms, data, and artificial intelligence, exhibit intertwined legitimacy challenges (Zhang, Gisca, Sadeghian Dehkordi, & Ahokangas, 2022) and are examples of a contemporary business context where managers need to develop novel legitimation processes.

This track invites papers that explore and/or explain how new business models – digital, service, sustainable, circular, ecosystemic, public organization, and social – are legitimated or achieve legitimacy in empirical contexts such as smart energy, creative industries, AI, 6G and Metaverse, and how the legitimacy of new business models could be approached from theoretical perspectives. Papers that focus on business model innovation and its linkages with legitimacy and legitimation are welcome.

Biloslavo, R., Bagnoli, C., Massaro, M., & Cosentino, A. (2020). Business model transformation toward sustainability: the impact of legitimation. *Management Decision*, Vol. 58 No. 8, pp. 1643-1662.

Lanzolla, G., & Markides, C. (2021). A business model view of strategy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(2), 540-553.

Press, M., Robert, I., & Maillefert, M. (2020). The role of linked legitimacy in sustainable business model development. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 89, 566-577.

Schiavi, G. S., & Behr, A. (2018). Emerging technologies and new business models: a review on disruptive business models. *Innovation & Management Review*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 338-355.

Snihur, Y., & Bocken, N. (2022). A call for action: The impact of business model innovation on business ecosystems, society, and planet. *Long Range Planning*, 102182.

Thomas, L. D., & Ritala, P. (2022). Ecosystem legitimacy emergence: A collective action view. *Journal of Management*, 48(3), 515-541.

Turcan, R. V. (2020). An Autoethnographic Inquiry into the Emergence of New Forms and Ways of Organizing. *Communication & Language at Work - CLAW*, 7(1), 136-153

Zhang, J., Gisca, O., Sadeghian Dehkordi, R., & Ahokangas, P (2022). Ecosystem legitimacy challenges in the platform, data, and artificial intelligence business models. *Journal of Business Models*, (ja).

Zott, C., Amit, R., & Massa, L. (2011). The business model: recent developments and future research. *Journal of management*, 37(4), 1019-1042.

## Track 4: Legitimation of newness in traditional and modern contexts

**Track chairs:** Nikhilesh Dholakia and Ian Reyes

Innovations and newness occur in modern and traditional contexts. We are familiar with newness in modern, contemporary settings and recognise the ephemeral, liquid nature of contemporary innovations and forms of newness (Bauman 2006). Innovation and newness in traditional contexts require greater effort to unearth and understand (Brown 2021). The contemporary world can benefit from traditional forms of innovation and newness. Conventional views equate and conflate newness with the breaking of traditions, recent research has sought to connect tradition with innovation (De Massis et al, 2016) identifying it as a competitive advantage (Suddaby et al, 2020; Suddaby & Jaskiewicz, 2020). Contexts range from tribal to venerable organisations, where best practices are ingrained in seemingly inviolable traditions. Disruptive change threatens traditional practices. Yet, innovative responses arise. Tradition can be invented and legitimated (Hobsbawm 1982). Where does this leave understanding of the interplay of legitimation with traditional and modern contexts?

Recognising the variety of contexts and how they affect and are affected by types of legitimation we are seeking papers that explore legitimation processes in traditional and/or modern contexts, e.g., ecosystem-centred and human-centred personal data management, FinTech, Brexit, de-globalization and late globalization (Turcan 2016; Turcan et al. 2020). We invite research-based papers – conceptual insights, literature-derived meta-learning, observation and analysis-based papers, fieldwork-based papers, experimental studies, survey-based studies, simulations – that compare, contrast, and interrelate modern and traditional forms of newness. We are interested in how legitimation is achieved (see, e.g., Turcan 2018), failures in legitimizing (Suddaby et al. 2017), how conceptualizations of legitimacy and legitimation come under transformational pressures (see, e.g., Berger & Luckmann 1967; Lyotard 1984).

Bauman, Z. (2006). *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor.

Brown, D. (2021), *Santería enthroned: art, ritual, and innovation in an Afro-Cuban religion*. Routledge.

De Massis, A., Frattini, F., Kotlar, J., Petruzzelli, A. M., & Wright, M. (2016). Innovation through tradition: Lessons from innovative family businesses and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 30(1), 93-116.

Hobsbawm, E. (1992). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge University Press.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Schechner, Richard (2003), *The future of ritual: Writings on culture and performance*. Routledge.

Suddaby, R., Bitektine, A., & Haack, P. (2017). Legitimacy. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11, 451–478

Suddaby, R., Coraiola, D., Harvey, C., & Foster, W. (2020). History and the micro-foundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(3), 530-556.

Suddaby, R., & Jaskiewicz, P. (2020). Managing traditions: A critical capability for family business success. *Family Business Review*, 33(3), 234-243.

Turcan, R. V. (2016). Exploring Late Globalization: A Viewpoint. *Markets, Globalization & Development Review* 1 (2): 4.

Turcan, R. V. (2018). Sociology of Knowledge Perspective on Entrepreneurship. In R. V. Turcan & N. M. Fraser (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Entrepreneurship* (pp. 433–455). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Turcan, R. V., Boujarzadeh, B. and Dholakia, N. (2020). Late Globalization and Evolution, Episodes and Epochs of Industries: Evidence from Danish Textile and Fashion Industry, 1945–2015. *Thunderbird International Business Review* 62: 515–530.



## Track 5: Legitimation of new behaviours

**Track chairs:** Alicia Blanco-González, Giorgia Miotto, Susana Diaz Iglesias

Legitimacy is a key element for success (Díez-Martín et al., 2021) and survival (Deephouse et al., 2017; Suchman, 1995). Organizations earn legitimacy by complying with social norms, beliefs and rules (Scott, 1995) and fulfilling stakeholder expectations (Deephouse et al., 2017). The Covid-19 pandemic, geopolitical insecurity, and economic uncertainty create a complex, ambiguous and uncertain environment (Díez-Martín et al., 2022). This affects perceptions and habits, creating new behaviours. If organizations do not adapt to the new behaviours, they lose competitive advantages and legitimacy (Miotto et al., 2020).

This track invites papers that explore how organizations, politics, institutions should/do legitimate their response to new behaviour and habits. This may include new consumption paradigm biased by psychological variables such as anxiety or fear (Kemp et al., 2021), or panic (Islam et al., 2021; Omar et al., 2021); new purchasing systems as NFTs, bitcoins (Albayati et al., 2020); new behaviour based on apps and technology (Degen & Kleeberg-Niepage, 2022); hybrid educational formats (Bojović et al., 2020); post-pandemic employee behaviour (Barrena-Martinez et al., 2019) fake news, post truth politics, populism, science denial and higher education internationalization (Turcan & Reilly, 2020; Turcan et al., 2021).

Albayati, H., Kim, S. K., & Rho, J. J. (2020). Accepting financial transactions using blockchain technology and cryptocurrency: A customer perspective approach. *Technology in Society*, 62

Barrena-Martinez, J., López-Fernández, M., & Romero-Fernández, P. M. (2019). The link between socially responsible human resource management and intellectual capital. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 26(1), 71–81.

Bojović, Ž., Bojović, P. D., Vujošević, D., & Šuh, J. (2020). Education in times of crisis: Rapid transition to distance learning. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 28(6), 1467–1489.

Deephouse, D. L., Bundy, J., Tost, L. ., & Suchman, M. (2017). Organizational legitimacy: Six key questions. *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, 27–54.

Degen, J., & Kleeberg-Niepage, A. (2022). The More We Tinder: Subjects, Selves and Society. *Human Arenas*, 5(1), 179–195.

Díez-Martín, F., Miotto, G., & Cachón-Rodríguez, G. (2022). Organizational legitimacy perception: Gender and uncertainty as bias for evaluation criteria. *Journal of Business Research*, 139(June 2021), 426–436.

Díez-Martín, F., Blanco-González, A., & Prado-Román, C. (2021). The intellectual structure of organizational legitimacy research: a co-citation analysis in business journals. *Review of Managerial Science*.

Islam, T., Pitafi, A. H., Arya, V., Wang, Y., Akhtar, N., Mubarik, S., & Xiaobei, L. (2021). Panic buying in the COVID-19 pandemic: A multi-country examination. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 59, 102357.

Kemp, E., Bui, M. (Myla), & Porter McDowell, I. I. I. (2021). Preparing for a crisis: examining the influence of fear and anxiety on consumption and compliance. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 38(3), 282–292.

Miotto, G., Del-Castillo-Feito, C., & Blanco-González, A. (2020). Reputation and legitimacy: Key factors for Higher Education Institutions' sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Research*.

Omar, N. A., Nazri, M. A., Ali, M. H., & Alam, S. S. (2021). The panic buying behavior of consumers during the COVID-19 pandemic: Examining the influences of uncertainty, perceptions of severity, perceptions of scarcity, and anxiety. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 62, 102600.

Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations* SAGE publications. Inc USA.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.

Turcan, R. V. and Reilly, J. E. (Eds.) (2020). *Populism and Higher Education Curriculum Development: Problem Based Learning as a Mitigating Response*. Palgrave Macmillan

Turcan, R., Juho, A., & Reilly, J. (2021). Advanced Structural Internationalization of Universities is Unethical. *Organization*, 28(6), 1059-1067.

## Key dates

**Feb 28, 2023:** Conference paper and Doctoral Consortium Application essay submission deadline

**Mar 31, 2023:** Acceptance letters sent

**May 15, 2023:** Registration deadline for the Doctoral Consortium and the Conference

**June 19-21, 2023:** Doctoral consortium

**June 22-24, 2023:** Conference

## Contact

Please direct your queries related to:

- Conference paper submissions to the **Track Chairs**
- All other Conference matters to the Conference Chair, **Prof Niall MacKenzie**.

## Publication opportunities

**European Journal of Management and Business Economics**  
**European Research on Management and Business Economics**  
**Journal of Business Models**  
**Markets, Globalization and Development Review**

## Organization

The Conference and its Doctoral Consortium are delivered by the **LNETN** project ([www.lnetn.aau.dk](http://www.lnetn.aau.dk)) in cooperation with the **Organizational Legitimacy Observatory** ([www.legitimacyobservatory.org](http://www.legitimacyobservatory.org)). LNETN, a **Marie Skłodowska-Curie European Training Network**, is part of the funding portfolio of the **Theory Building Research Programme** ([www.tbrp.aau.dk/funding-portfolio](http://www.tbrp.aau.dk/funding-portfolio)).

## Disclaimer

[LNETN] project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 860364. This communication reflects only the author's view and that the Agency is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

**We look forward to welcoming you to our LNETN Conference in Copenhagen in June 2023!**

On behalf of the Conference Team  
Romeo V. Turcan  
LNETN Project Coordinator



**TBRP – Theory Building Research Programme**