

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 43: Qualitative Research with Archival Data



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

Convenors:

Anders Dahl Krabbe

Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
ank.si@cbs.dk

Stine Grodal

Northeastern University, USA
s.grodal@northeastern.edu

Mia Chang-Zunino

ESCP Business School, France
mchang@escp.eu

Call for Papers

The central tenet of qualitative research is theory development (Bansal et al., 2018; Eisenhardt, 1989). Qualitative researchers have developed an arsenal of tools for theory development, including techniques for research design, data collection, and data analysis. In past years, archival qualitative data – textual traces that actors (e.g., people, organizations or markets) leave behind when they go about their daily business – were often used as a side dish to interviews and ethnographic observations and thus were not given much methodological consideration (Yates, 2014). However, with the recent growth in the availability of archival data due to digitalization, archival research has become more prominent within the toolkit that qualitative scholars use to develop theory (e.g., Aversa et al., 2021; Grodal, 2018). The time is thus ripe to give this important tool for theory development the attention it deserves. The goal of this sub-theme is to bring together qualitative scholars who work with archival data to both create a community of scholars engaged in these methods and to begin a collective conversation about the tools and methods that we need to develop to push research forward in this domain. This sub-theme is an extension of the very



successful sub-theme on the same topic at the EGOS Colloquium 2023 in Cagliari.

Developing specific techniques to build theory from archival data is important for several reasons:

First, archival materials allows researchers to study the actions, cognitions, and meanings produced outside of the research context. In this respect, archives act as ethnographic materials which, unlike interviews but similar to traditional ethnography, enable us to examine how actions unfolded naturalistically (Jerolmack & Khan, 2014).

Second, unlike both ethnography and interviews, the use of archival data allows us to study the unfolding of organizational phenomena across longer time periods, enriching longitudinal and process studies (Langley, 1999; Langley et al., 2013). Through archives we also gain access to historical events and processes no longer accessible to us in the present (Bansal et al., 2018; Kieser, 1994; Rowlinson et al., 2014).

Third, archival data allows us to study new phenomena. For example, archival data allows us to trace phenomena only manifest in aggregated patterns that are not readily observed with an ethnographic gaze, such as field-level studies (Ventresca & Mohr, 2002). In addition, gaining access to elite, hidden, secretive organizations can prove quite difficult (Monahan & Fisher, 2015), yet, these can be settings where critical organizational actions unfold. Archives are often a clever way to reveal this data, whether obtained freely (for instance, through Freedom of Information Act in the United States) or through whistleblowers (e.g., The Fincen Files, The Facebook Files). New phenomena are often considered fruitful contexts for developing theory out of qualitative data (Locke & Golden-Biddle, 1997), so archives expand these possibilities.

Fourth, archival data allows us to study interactions across different spatial locations without having to travel or be physically present. As organizations and markets are increasingly globalizing, being able to access data from multiple geographical locations is important (Mortensen & Haas, 2018). Archives also open up data that simultaneously spans multiple temporal or spatial locations, allowing the researcher to transcend the physical limitations of being in multiple places at the same time.

The rise in prominence of archival research has been spurred by the digitalization of “texts”. This has created a bonanza for qualitative researchers who now have access to vast repositories of information on nearly any topic that our creative minds might ponder. Some of this digitalization pertains to recent events as our social and work lives increasingly move online leaving, digital traces of interactions both within and across organizations. The digitalization of data is not limited to the present. Textual sources have been produced for centuries, and these older archives are increasingly being digitalized, providing us with unprecedented access to textual data that span both time and space. For example, all articles



that have ever been published in the *New York Times* are now available with the touch of a keyboard and The Library of Congress' is steadily expanding the digitalization of its entire content.

While archival research is increasing in prominence, we lack adequate techniques to tackle each stage of research, from sampling to collection to analysis, and lastly theory development. Because archival data is not generated, collected and stored in the same way as more traditional qualitative data sources like interviews and ethnographic observations, then we face new challenges in how to generate theories from such data. In particular, new challenges arises both from the *heterogeneity* and *abundance* of the archival data:

The *first* core challenge and opportunity that archival qualitative analysis poses for qualitative researchers is that data is *abundant* – there is a nearly infinite availability of data but our capacity to collect, analyze and theorize these data are finite. Traditionally, qualitative researchers have drawn on snowball sampling (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981) or convenience sampling. These techniques arise out of the limited availability of possible sources. As our study proceeds, we might move to theoretical sampling (Eisenhardt, 1989; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) to construct a dataset and refine our theory. But given that the surge in archival materials now confronts us with the problem of abundance rather than scarcity, we need to consider different approaches to sampling. Given both the constraints of human cognitive capacity and the time constraints put on researchers to complete their work, it is not possible to collect, and then analyze, the troves of archival data now available to us.

The *second* core tension is between the *heterogeneity* of archival data and the need to create parsimonious generalizable theories. Traditional qualitative research emphasizes data collected first-hand by the researcher or research team. Archives may instead have been created by multiple stakeholders (sometimes anonymous), for different audiences, and written in multiple genres (Orlikowski & Yates, 1994). For this reason, archival analysis in particular foregrounds epistemological considerations and possibilities. Such data are situated social products (Prior, 2003); they may be the subject of study (their contents) or the object of study (who created them, why, under what conditions). In addition, digital “texts” or sources are not only written materials; they include videos, audio, visuals; moreover, they can be paired with physical objects as well (Phillips & Hardy, 2002). One person or organization may have generated various types of this data. Each source is imbued with cultural meanings that cannot be separated from its medium (Meyer et al., 2013). For example, the meaning of an emoji :) cannot be adequately captured through verbal description. This heterogeneity creates challenges for how we analyze archival data in order to create parsimonious theories.

In terms of sampling, heterogenous sources make it more difficult to draw boundaries around relevant data: archives may come from different channels, creators, dates, and other



attributes. Figuring out how each piece of data is related to another can be daunting. While archives make triangulation more feasible (Jick, 1979), how to connect data may not be obvious. Heterogeneity, as well as abundance, connects and threads vast amounts of data to each other. Anyone who has gotten lost following a link trail across the internet can understand the issue of setting boundaries around data collection and analysis.

These are just some of the questions pertaining qualitative research using archival data that we hope to address in this sub-theme. In general, the task which lies before us is to identify the unique challenges associated with collecting, analyzing, and theorizing with archival data. Studies in this sub-themes may include, but are not restricted to theoretical or empirical papers that cover these topics:

- Reflections and/or proposed techniques for using archival methods
- Studies drawing on archival sources whether historical or digital such as online discussion forums, social media, “digital ethnographies” or other sources
- Studies that rely on contemporaneous and dynamic archives, such as a currently unfolding or ongoing event, e.g., “whistleblower files”
- Studies that focus on archives from a single organization, place, or single event; as well as studies that draw from multiple organizations, broad industries or field, or connect various events together
- Studies that use archives as a primary data source, and supplement or combine it with first-hand sources (interviews or ethnographies)

References

- Aversa, P., Bianchi, E., Gaio, L., & Nucciarelli, A. (2021): “The Grand Tour: The Role of Catalyzing Places for Industry Emergence.” *Academy of Management Journal*, 65 (6), 2058–2091.
- Bansal, P., Smith, W.K., & Vaara, E. (2018): “From the Editors: New Ways of Seeing through Qualitative Research.” *Academy of Management Journal*, 61 (4), 1189–1195.
- Biernacki, P., & Waldorf, D. (1981): “Snowball Sampling: Problems and Techniques of Chain Referral Sampling.” *Sociological Methods Research*, 10 (2), 141–163.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989): “Building Theories from Case Study Research.” *Academy of Management Review*, 14 (4), 532–550.
- Grodal, S. (2018): “Field expansion and contraction: How communities shape social and symbolic boundaries.” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63 (4), 783–818.
- Jerolmack, C., & Khan, S. (2014): “Talk is Cheap: Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy.” *Sociological Methods & Research*, 43 (2), 178–209.
- Jick, T.D. (1979): “Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action.” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24 (4), 602–611.
- Kieser, A. (1994): “Why Organization Theory Needs Historical Analyses – And How This Should Be Performed.” *Organization Science*, 5 (4), 608–620.



- Langley, A. (1999): "Strategies for Theorizing from Process Data." *Academy of Management Review*, 24 (4), 691–710.
- Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A.H. (2013): "Process Studies of Change in Organization and Management: Unveiling Temporality, Activity, and Flow." *Academy of Management Journal*, 56 (1), 1–13.
- Locke, K., & Golden-Biddle, K. (1997): "Constructing Opportunities for Contribution: Structuring Intertextual Coherence and 'Problematizing' in Organizational Studies." *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (5), 1023–1062.
- Meyer, R.E., Höllerer, M.A., Jancsary, D., & van Leeuwen, T. (2013): "The Visual Dimension in Organizing, Organization, and Organization Research: Core Ideas, Current Developments, and Promising Avenues." *Academy of Management Annals*, 7 (1), 489–555.
- Monahan, T., & Fisher, J.A. (2015): "Strategies for obtaining access to secretive or guarded organizations." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 44 (6), 709–736.
- Mortensen, M., & Haas, M.R. (2018): Perspective–Rethinking Teams: From Bounded Membership to Dynamic Participation." *Organization Science*, 29 (2), 341–355.
- Orlikowski, W.J., & Yates, J. (1994): "Genre Repertoire: The Structuring of Communicative Practices in Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39 (4), 541–574.
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002): *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Prior, L. (2003): *Using Documents in Social Research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Rowlinson, M., Hassard, J., & Decker, S. (2014): "Research Strategies for Organizational History: A Dialogue Between Historical Theory and Organization Theory." *Academy of Management Review*, 39 (3), 250–274.
- Strauss, A.L., & Corbin, J.M. (1990): *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Ventresca, M.J., & Mohr, J.W. (2002): "Archival Research Methods." In: J.A.C. Baum (ed.): *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 805–828.
- Yates, J. (2014): "Understanding Historical Methods in Organization Studies." In: M. Bucheli & R.D. Wadhvani (eds.): *Organizations in Time: History, Theory, Methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 265–283.

