

Call for Science

A Unique Special Issue: AI-Enabled Frontiers in Organizational Science

Special Issue Editors:

Claudine Gartenberg (Wharton)

Sharique Hasan (Duke)

Lamar Pierce (Washington University in St. Louis)

Christopher Bail (Duke)

Hengchen Dai (UCLA)

Oliver Hauser (Cambridge)

Hatim Rahman (Northwestern)

Dennis Zhang (Washington University in St. Louis)

Introduction: Tools and Innovation for Better, Not More

Our editorial last month prompted scholars across fields to ask a fundamental question about artificial intelligence and social science: do we want it to produce faster, cheaper versions of what we already do, or do we want fundamentally *new* science? This special issue is our attempt to reimagine the organizational and social science research of tomorrow.

Organization Science was founded as a bet on escaping the constraints of local search and incrementalism. In the journal's 1990 inaugural article, Daft and Lewin urged us to break out of the "normal science straitjacket." Over the last 35 years, *Organization Science* has published new and often weird ideas that have radically shaped our thinking about organizational phenomena *and* how to study them.

This special issue thus returns to the founding mission of *Organization Science* to seek what March (1991) expressed as "the exploration of new possibilities." We want to shift our focus to how AI is changing the production of science and how it can expand our knowledge, rather than merely increasing the number of papers through efficiency and reduced labor.

Current evidence, both from our editorial (Gartenberg, Hasan, Murray and Pierce, 2026) and subsequent studies across fields suggests that AI is driving us to produce more, and in many cases, worse papers. It is obvious that a key question for us is not "how do we write 14 papers

in a year?" but, rather, **what kinds of knowledge can we create when the tools of inquiry themselves change?**

What we're looking for

In this call for science, we seek contributions that reimagine what a social science research contribution is in an AI-enabled world. We are encouraging researchers to experiment with wild ideas and radical innovation rather than obvious incremental improvements. As Girotra, Terwiesch, and Ulrich (2010) argue, good ideas come not only from a high volume of high-quality ideas, but also from a high variance and our ability to spot the truly exceptional ones. We can't fear false positives as we seek the right-tail ideas that emerge from the most ambitious and creative uses of artificial intelligence in the social sciences.

We are open to a wide range of contribution types, all of which will be considered of equivalent status and value as more traditional full-length articles. These include but are not limited to the following.

- *AI-enabled research loops under human direction*: Submissions may develop systems that support end-to-end or partial scientific workflows. It is unclear when or even whether these loops can perform valid social science or are just Potemkin villages of slop masquerading as research, but it is important to test their capabilities and limits.
- *Reusable research infrastructure*: Submissions can also create other research infrastructure for social science, including custom models, multi-agent workflows, simulation environments, etc., that can be used by other scholars.
- *New forms of measurement*: Submissions may use AI to measure constructs in text, audio, or video that were previously difficult or impossible to observe at scale.
- *AI-enabled qualitative and theory-building work*: Submissions may use AI systems to generate, triangulate, or extend qualitative work or theory. The key criterion is not whether AI was used, but whether the work advances theory in a way that is important and insightful and not slop.
- *Synthetic social systems*: Submissions may build or evaluate synthetic communities that allow social scientists to explore social dynamics in new ways.
- *New approaches to established research designs*: Submissions may use AI to improve established research designs (approaches deployable without AI), such as improving

causal identification and mechanism exploration. Such work improves what can be credibly inferred, and not merely speeds up existing analyses.

- *Critical, diagnostic, or boundary-setting work*: We also invite submissions that identify the limits of AI-enabled social science. Contributions may explore where AI systems drift, obscure judgment, or otherwise undermine the validity of knowledge. Cautionary contributions are welcome when they improve the field's ability to use AI responsibly and rigorously.

This list is not exhaustive. We expect some important contributions to be things we have not even imagined. While the specifics of what we are looking for are less clear, what we do not want is much more obvious: conventional full-length papers with AI-related content or typical application. Nor are we looking for "AI slop," including submission with minimal author engagement. For authors with conventional full-length papers created through unique and radical applications of AI technology, we want the applications, not the full-length paper. The full-length paper can be submitted elsewhere (or as a separate submission at our journal) without concern for overlap.

Process

In an effort to encourage submissions that push boundaries in innovative ways, we are running a three-stage process:

Stage 1: Submit research proposal and package (Deadline: November 1, 2026):

- **A short proposal**: approximately 3-5 pages / 1,500–2,000 words plus references, which should describe the core intended scientific contribution. This should include a description of what you have done, what you hope to do, the key risks you face in fully executing your vision, and how organizational and social science would change if you are successful.
- **Technical appendix or supplement**: The technical appendix should provide the details needed to evaluate and understand the work.
- **Research artifact**: prototype and repository. Authors should provide a Git repository or equivalent artifact that includes a prototype or proof of concept for the work.

We would prefer submissions of boundary-pushing prototypes rather than polished papers.

After receiving submissions, we will convene the Special Issue editors to select a small number of submissions for further development. We see this as a hard filter and narrow gate: once proposals make it through this initial gate, the aim is for them to have a place in the issue (with rare removal at editorial discretion due to ethical or unusual circumstances).

Submissions will be evaluated on a number of criteria that include but are not limited to:

- Novelty
- Feasibility
- Stage of development
- Ethicality
- Reproducibility
- Scalability
- Potential use and adoption
- Potential to expand the research frontier through new or better research.

Stage 2: Engage in development process (January-May, 2027):

Selected proposals will undergo a development process to build and refine the final project deliverables. The development process will be both offline and in-person, with a workshop over two days (we are currently aiming for February 27-28, 2027, although this date may change), where participants will convene to collaboratively develop their projects and brainstorm how to improve the peer review process for this type of research. Workshop attendance by at least one author is expected, although exceptions and accommodations for financial, visa, health, and family reasons will be considered.

Stage 3: Finalization of research projects (Summer, 2027):

The final product is a special issue featuring a mix of two publication types. The most developed contributions will appear as ~five-page *Science/Nature*-style articles presenting the main insights from the research, along with a detailed technical appendix and either a public GitHub repository or, equivalently, an accessible research object.

For attempts that did not develop as far, we will provide a “letters” format: short one- or two-page contributions that distill the key learnings so the field can benefit from the work. In both cases, the bar is similar: did we learn something that advances organizational research through AI-driven innovation in research process?

We emphasize that *Organization Science* will treat these contributions as true peer-reviewed articles. The value of the scientific contribution is not dependent on the written length of an article, as journals such as *Science* and *Nature* have long attested. **Published articles in the special issue should be considered equivalent to more traditional full-length articles in a scholar's research record** with shorter "letters" more equivalent to a research note.

Logistics

We welcome submissions from scholars across the social sciences and adjacent fields, so long as they address organizational or managerial implications, broadly interpreted. Relevant areas include, but are not limited to:

- management and organizations;
- strategy;
- entrepreneurship and innovation;
- organizational behavior;
- operations;
- economics;
- sociology;
- psychology;
- computational social science;
- political science;
- computer science, when the contribution is directed toward social science.

Timeline:

Stage 1: Submission portal opens	October 1, 2026
Stage 1: Submit research proposal and package	November 1, 2026
Stage 1: Selected projects notified by	January 10, 2027
Stage 2: Engage in the development process	January-May, 2027
Stage 2: In-person workshop	February 27-28, 2027 (tentative)
Stage 3: Finalization of research projects	Summer, 2027
Target special issue date	Fall, 2027

FAQ

Can I submit a traditional empirical paper that used AI at some point in the workflow?

We're not looking for traditional empirical papers, but the innovative use or application of AI in the workflow could constitute a submission in and of itself. A shorter submission with AI core to the scientific contribution would not preclude you from submitting or having submitted the full paper elsewhere so long as the focus is different.

Can the contribution be qualitative?

Yes, we welcome qualitative and mixed-method contributions.

Can this be theoretical?

Yes, we welcome work that uses AI to build theory, provided the process is transparent and the theoretical contribution is clear.

Can I submit something that later supports a longer paper elsewhere?

Yes, provided the submitted contribution is itself publishable as a research artifact and does not create copyright or duplicate-publication conflicts.

What if my data cannot be shared?

Since the aim of this issue is to disseminate insights on AI-enabled social sciences, the research must be reproducible by others. Projects that cannot share sufficient data to be reproduced are unlikely to be a good fit for this issue. Synthetic data may be an appropriate substitute if the insights can be reproduced on a case-by-case basis.

What if my workflow depends on proprietary AI models?

Authors should select infrastructure that other researchers have a reasonable chance of accessing.

Are negative results or cautionary studies welcome?

Yes. Work that identifies failures or limits of AI-enabled social science can make an important contribution.

Who should I contact if I have questions?

Authors can contact Claudine (cgart@wharton.upenn.edu) or Sharique (sharique.hasan@duke.edu) with any questions.

Submission portal: mc.manuscriptcentral.com/orgsci

Daft, R. L., & Lewin, A. Y. (1990). Can organization studies begin to break out of the normal science straitjacket? An editorial essay. *Organization science*, 1(1), 1-9.

Gartenberg, C., Hasan, S., Murray, A., & Pierce, L. (2026). More versus better: Artificial intelligence, incentives, and the emerging crisis in peer review. *Organization Science*, 37(3), 795-812.

Girotra, K., Terwiesch, C., & Ulrich, K. T. (2010). Idea generation and the quality of the best idea. *Management science*, 56(4), 591-605.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization science*, 2(1), 71-87.