

PERSPECTIVES AT ORGANIZATION SCIENCE

Organization Science has published more than 35 peer-reviewed *Perspectives* over more than 20 years. Although *Perspectives* have played an important role for the journal, there has been limited author guidance to explain what they are and what they are not. This document provides both content guidance for potential *Perspectives* submissions as well as clarity on the current processes through which *Perspectives* might be accepted for publication.

What qualifies as a potential *Perspectives* piece?

Published *Perspectives* are intended to be peer-reviewed papers that make substantial contributions to advancing theory. They are not second-class publications with lower review standards and should be considered top publications in the evaluation of any author's research portfolio. Consequently, any *Perspectives* piece will need to clearly explain its first-order importance and how it will influence our study of important organizational problems, theories, and identified empirical evidence. *Perspectives* represent logical arguments and evidence of the authors and not the opinion or beliefs of the current editorial team.

Perspectives should be informed by and reflect existing research literatures across relevant fields. In particular, *Perspectives* should be of broad interest to multiple lines of research and theoretical frameworks and should make this relevance clear and explicit throughout the paper. Even though they can be on a specific topic or issue, the wider the implications of the discussion are, the more likely we are to consider it as a *Perspectives* piece. Although all published papers represent some degree of opinion, *Perspectives* should be logically argued, based on defensible assumptions and theoretical priors, rather than unsupported beliefs or opinions. The arguments should be supported with evidence, where appropriate, and potentially even formal analysis of that evidence.

The existence of the *Perspectives* category does not indicate our disinterest in high-quality verbal theory papers submitted through the regular track. It is impossible to define a discrete boundary between these two paper types, but theory papers would typically provide clear testable propositions or a framework to generate them.

Organization Science can roughly categorize *Perspectives* into four categories:

1. The introduction or improvement of important processes or methods for advancing theory.
 - a. Behfar and Okhuysen (2018) explains the important role of abductive reasoning in advancing theory through data and empirics.
 - b. von Nordenflycht (2023) presents an argument on better processes for improving theory.
2. The introduction of new empirical frameworks, approaches, or principles for addressing important organizational problems. These *Perspectives* might highlight new or modified empirical approaches that could substantially change how we test existing or new theories about people and organizations.
 - a. Anthony, Bechky, and Fayard (2023) promote a system view of human/AI collaboration and the implications this has for qualitative methods.
 - b. Kluppel, Pierce, and Snyder (2018) introduce how the historical persistence literature can help causally connect culture and institutions with modern organizational heterogeneity.

- c. Carton and Tewfik (2016) build typologies and frameworks for expanding our views of conflict management in work groups with recognition of positive and negative spillovers.
 - d. Anteby (2013) argues that the taboo of intermingling personal experience with research is too extreme and impedes our ability to generate and develop theoretical insights.
3. The introduction of or reconceptualization of important constructs or definitions. These *Perspectives* argue that introducing, redefining, or reconceptualizing these constructs might fundamentally change how we theorize and empirically test causal relationships as well as design policy and practice to improve organizations or societies.
- a. Pillemer (2024) introduces the self-presentation approach of strategic authenticity.
 - b. Mortensen and Haas (2018) reconceptualize teams as having fluid and fuzzy boundaries and present the implications of this for existing and future work.
4. Challenges to or development of theoretical explanations of important organizational phenomena. These *Perspectives* identify logical flaws or incompleteness of existing theory, and why adapting or correcting such theory would more completely explain observable outcomes and processes.
- a. Yap, Madan, and Puranam (2022) offer a theoretical model where complex hierarchical structures can generate upward status disagreement between formal ranks and informal cues.

Perspectives are not “review” pieces (in the manner of either systematic or integrative reviews). There are multiple journals/outlets for each of these kinds of studies across the field of organization and management research. *Perspectives* are also not pure methods papers, dataset papers, or articles that make methodology contributions, as all of these are welcomed as standard submissions to *Organization Science*.

Perspectives Submission Process

Papers should be submitted through the standard review track under the perspective submission track, through which they would follow the standard review process—the same as a regular submission. Alternatively, a paper submitted under the regular track might receive a revision request conditional on the paper switching to the *Perspectives* track. This request could happen at two stages. First, a deputy editor might give the authors a “desk reject and resubmit” if the paper has potential as a *Perspectives* piece. Second, a senior editor might, in consultation with a deputy editor, issue a “major revision” or “minor revision” conditional on the paper switching to the perspectives track. This decision would be issued only after receiving reviews on the original submission.