

Organization Science Special Issue Call for Papers

**Remote and Hybrid Work:
Transforming People and Organizations in a New Era**

Guest Editors

Ellen Ernst Kossek, Purdue University
Bradley J. Alge, Purdue University
Jennifer L. Gibbs, University of California, Santa Barbara
Terri L. Griffith, Simon Fraser University
N. Sharon Hill, George Washington University

Organization Science Senior Editor

Alan Benson, University of Minnesota

Submission window: November 1, 2024- July 15, 2025

Theme and Objectives

This special issue fosters new theories and policies for modern work practice involving remote and hybrid work in organizations and their multifaceted impacts on workers' lives, within and beyond a workplace and across diverse occupations. Emerging empirical evidence suggests that the growing flexibility of where job tasks are done due to increasing remote (offsite) and hybrid (mix of on & offsite) work – need not harm performance or advancement (Bloom, Han & Liang, 2024). These work arrangements highlight tensions and opportunities to broaden organization science on the growing prevalence of remote and hybrid work by incorporating insights from various disciplines, fields, and levels of analysis. Considering work as a part of life, versus a place to go, or a role separate from one's life, illuminates new relationships across location, time, connectivity, processes, and employment conditions. This shifting perspective has disparate implications for people, teams, and organizations across widely divergent economic and social contexts. More than ever, the location and timing of work and personal life experiences are coupled with continuing social and technical changes from within and outside the organization (Lee, 2023). This special issue brings together research speaking to the full human experience pertaining to remote and hybrid working varying in extensiveness (Gajendran, Ponnappalli, Wang, & Javalagi, 2024), and geographic locations from home to third places within and across labor markets, economies, communities, and national borders. Research in this special issue will challenge our thinking and expand our understanding of the opportunities and challenges confronting individuals, teams, leaders, and organizations grappling with this transformation of work in the Remote and Hybrid Era (RAH).

The Remote and Hybrid (RAH) Era, ushered in by the expansion of work from home (WFH) during the pandemic and the rapid digitalization of work and personal life, has forever disrupted traditional work environments organized in a centralized employment setting. While building on decades of research on virtual work and collaboration (e.g., DeSanctis & Monge, 1999; Fulk & DeSanctis, 1995; Raghuram et al., 2019) and technology's evolving role in organizational form, function, and business strategies (e.g., Bailey et al., 2022; Zammuto et al., 2007), the RAH Era opens new frontiers of work experiences, redefining how work is organized, monitored, and

managed and blurring the lines between work and nonwork domains. This transformation has major implications for workers' experiences on and off the job—including family and personal life, the employment relationship, the economics of hybrid and remote working, and the meaning of work (Bailey et al., 2022; Leonardi & Treem, 2020).

Yet, considerable previous organizational research focuses on rational productivity and economic benefits sometimes overlooking critical underlying social and collective aspects of remote and hybrid work arrangements. For example, recent reviews (e.g., Calderon-Monge & Ribeiro-Soriano, 2023; Gradillas & Llewellyn & Thomas, 2023; Teubner & Stockhinger, 2020) center more on strategic information systems, technical, financial, and marketing aspects of digitalization than on implications for organizational behavior, human resource, labor relations, and worker issues. The research on organizing and management issues, such as Bailey and colleagues' (2022) special issue, focused on emerging technologies but not remote and hybrid work specifically. Below we briefly elaborate on some of the additional challenges and opportunities we see in the RAH Era.

The Remote and Hybrid Era expands the boundaries (and reach) of organizations beyond the dynamics and economic outcomes of technological and work arrangements considered “organizational” to include implications for the well-being of employees, the work team, the family, the community, and broader society. We see wide variation in attitudes, access to and consequences of remote and hybrid work. Narratives on the benefits and risks of remote and hybrid work from multiple stakeholders across the organizational hierarchy from CEOs to managers and workers can be widely divergent. This landscape and other changes highlight risks and benefits for organizational culture, productivity, innovation, teamwork, and collaboration (Blay, Froese, Taras, & Gunkel, 2023; Gibbs, Mengel, Siemroth, 2024; Yang, Holtz, Jaffe et al, 2022), as well as employment contract conditions covering a wide range of issues such as access to flexible schedules, and overwork and overtime expectations. Organizational science is central to understanding current and future ways of working toward joint humane and productive outcomes.

Organizational shifts to hybrid and remote work also accentuate growing power dynamics and “contested terrain” (Edwards, 1979) between individuals, teams, leaders, and organizations, regarding control over the work-nonwork boundary (Kossek, Dumas, Piszczek & Allen, 2021; Kossek, Perrigino & Lautsch, 2023; Stanko & Beckman, 2015) and the monitoring of work hours and locations (Andrews, 2024). Evidence of this trend is illustrated in the growth of management attempts to enforce back-to-the-office mandates, which are sometimes accompanied by increasingly vitriolic employee firing threats (Westfall, 2023). Moreover, AI and online scheduling and work systems often schedule employees' availability in concert with varying customer demands, which creates greater economic insecurity and risk for workers (Lambert, 2008).

These tumultuous shifts in terms of how, when, and where work is done bring about the need for holistic balanced scholarly scrutiny of their critical implications for the lives of workers as whole people – their inextricably linked work and nonwork lives that can be dually conflicting and enriching. We highlight that the narratives on digital technologies, sometime diverge from those on remote and hybrid work. Digital technologies serve as embedded components of hybrid and remote work systems and increasingly play roles in workers' lives, reshape social relationships, and affect well-being and the meaning of work (Callen, Bechky & Fayard, 2023). Many studies accentuate the objective positive characteristics of these new technologies, under-emphasizing negative social outcomes and inequalities that arise from their use. For example, Zammuto and colleagues (2007)

argue that the pervasive use of information technologies (IT) in the workplace affords less hierarchy and enables new functions such as mass collaboration across time and distance. This claim stands in contrast to the rising debate over unequal access to remote and hybrid work, and rising work-life inequality, employer job control, work-life flexibility backlash, and negative psychological impacts (Hill et al, 2022; Kossek & Lautsch, 2018; Kossek, et al, 2023; Perrigino, Dunford, & Wilson, 2018). Such dynamics transform social, physical, and temporal work-nonwork boundaries, their fluidity, and impact work and personal relationships.

There are many other issues of inclusivity affecting remote and hybrid work, including frontline workers who may not be able to work remotely. Moreover, given the over-representation of minoritized employees in the service industry (e.g., health care) and some manufacturing jobs (e.g., food) (Kossek & Lee, 2020), many front-line workers are still being left behind and have unequal access and well-being outcomes in the modern workplace. Additionally, research shows remote and hybrid work, while opening access to labor market participation and more work-life flexible arrangements, can be implemented in ways that have negative impacts on the career advancement and stress of caregivers, who are often women (Kossek, et al., 2021; Villamor, Hill, Kossek & Foley, 2023). Thus, we see evolving tensions between and within work and nonwork outcomes of remote and hybrid work (Kossek & Lautsch, 2018; Villamor, et al., 2023), and mixed effects on job boundary control, advancement, and well-being (Dragano, & Lunau, 2020); Gurchiek, 2024; Hill et al., 2022; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006). Work schedules, availability, productivity, privacy, job security, health and well-being, and performance management are all in play.

We also see rising trends in understanding the implications of increased embedding of artificial intelligence, digitalization, and datafication in remote and hybrid work (Leonardi & Treem, 2020). Overall, the pace and magnitude of the current digital transformation – and its effects on people, organizations, and work – are unprecedented. It raises questions particularly for remote and hybrid workers about the role of the home as a workplace and social relationships with family and friends as well as co-workers and managers. Bailey and colleagues (2022, p. 1) offer detailed considerations of the advantages of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, analytics, robotics, blockchain, and 3-D printing. They note that technology is relational and we see this as an opportunity for more integrated interdisciplinary theorizing on the likely mixed implications for people and organizations. We are entering a new frontier of an environment for work, raising questions about the role of the office or the manufacturing plant, and more generally, the “workplace” and “work” in people’s everyday lives.

Overall, the rapid evolution of remote and hybrid work, coupled with the somewhat fragmented nature of past research necessitates a broader consideration of the dynamics and outcomes in this new era. However, the technological pace of change significantly outstrips that of our organizational research. This special issue is an opportunity to revisit and take stock of how the rise of remote and hybrid work and concomitant digitalization brings positive and negative developments for the management of people, teams, and organizations —and how we can prepare for the future?

Scope of Special Issue and Sample Topics

In this special issue, we are interested in scholarship from the many disciplines and fields examining remote and hybrid work. This includes, but is not limited to business, cognitive science,

communications, computer science, family studies, economics, engineering, entrepreneurship, human resource management, information systems, innovation, labor relations, management, political science, psychology, organizational behavior and theory, sociology, strategic management, technology, and related disciplines and fields. Additionally, we especially encourage, cross-disciplinary papers that provide multiple lenses on remote and hybrid work. We encourage both conceptual papers pushing theory in new directions and rigorously designed and executed empirical papers. We are open to different levels of analysis (individual, team, organization, society/culture), so long as papers are not limited to only the individual level of analysis but also consider other nested contextual influences that have implications for employing organizations. We invite a variety of methods: such as qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, lab, field, multi-level, longitudinal, experimental, and archival. We welcome papers that integrate multiple levels of analysis, compare multiple stakeholder and/or disciplinary lenses, and examine the possible mixed consequences of remote and hybrid work. Below we list illustrative research questions (not exhaustive) that might be appropriate for this special issue.

Remote and Hybrid Work and Teams (and Social Relationships).

- How are individual and team boundaries, as well as personal and work boundaries, affected by digital transformation?
- What types of remote and hybrid work designs allow for autonomy and flexibility while also combatting social and professional isolation?
- Is remote work inherently isolating?
- How do temporalities change and align for multicultural global teams that communicate electronically?
- How do different configurations of remote and hybrid collaboration differentially influence team dynamics and outcomes?
- How do remote and hybrid work arrangements affect relationships in a blended social environment with frontline workers, leaders, co-workers, customers?
- Can emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence and virtual reality address the reduced social connection in remote and hybrid work?
- How does remote and hybrid work affect team collaboration and innovation?

Remote and Hybrid Work and Organizational Culture.

- What role does the formal office, plant or other workplace play in modern and future work?
- Can organizational culture be created when a majority of workers are remote or hybrid?
- How is remote and hybrid work transforming workplace culture and norms?
- How does remote and hybrid work affect collective understanding across organizational stakeholders?
- How do organizations ensure consistency in the organizational acculturation process, including, but not limited to onboarding?
- How do our conceptualizations of time and productivity change as a result of hybrid and remote working in the digital economy?
- How can gig workers be better protected in the remote and hybrid era?
- What role do unions, professional organizations, or guilds play in the education or support of remote and hybrid workers?

Remote and Hybrid Work: Leaders, Technologies, and Strategies.

- How can organizations and leaders balance organizational strategic goals with employee flexibility demands?
- What are strategies for creating sustainable remote and hybrid work arrangements that contribute to organizations' competitive advantage? How do job designs, strategies, technological arrangements of remote and hybrid work affect the likelihood of augmenting or automating work?
- How do remote and hybrid work designs engender staffing decisions across crowdsourcing, gig work, or automation?
- Will theories involving frequent high touch or high contact leadership become less (or more) relevant as remote and hybrid work increases?
- What new forms of leadership are necessary for meeting the unique challenges of remote and hybrid work settings? How do effective leadership strategies differ between fully remote and different configurations of hybrid work?
- What new skills and competencies do leaders need to manage remote and hybrid work in their occupational contexts?

Remote and Hybrid Work: Knowledge Sharing, Creativity, and Innovation

- What factors drive individuals, teams, organizations, and industries to acquire and/or share knowledge with other entities within or across boundaries?
- What processes do individuals, teams, organizations, and industries utilize to source knowledge and determine its credibility?
- In what way will emerging technologies expand individual, team, organizational, and industry capabilities to share knowledge, create, and innovate?
- How can individuals, teams, organizations and industries structure their hybrid work in such a way as to maximize creative or innovative potential?
- What structures and processes best support divergent thinking in teams? What structures and processes best support convergent thinking in teams?
- What is the best configuration to position teams (e.g., global product development teams) for success?
- With artificial intelligence increasing, how can organizations have confidence that workers' contributions are their own? What risks do informational source ambiguity and proprietary ownership of knowledge pose to the organization? Will organizations care?

Remote and Hybrid Work: Privacy, Control, and Digital Surveillance?

- How does remote and hybrid work affect the nexus of control between organizations and individuals?
- What is the effect of organizational and other forms of surveillance that create an 'always on' visibility of individuals? How does this visibility or inescapability affect their well-being and performance?
- How does digitalization in the remote and hybrid workplace, especially through algorithmic systems, lead to new forms of organizational surveillance and control?
- How do strategies to ensure control in remote and hybrid work affect behavior?

- How can individuals and teams leverage the digital exhaust of their work in productive ways?
- In what ways is remote and hybrid work empowering versus a tool of managerial control?

Remote and Hybrid Work: Well-being and the Work-Life/Work-Family Nexus

- What are the effects of remote and hybrid workplaces on employee well-being outcomes such as stress, burnout, physical, mental health, work-life balance, and family satisfaction?
- How are employees' nonwork relationships (e.g., families, friends, community networks) and well-being influenced by the extent and type of hybrid and remote work arrangements and the growing digitization of work?
- How do employees' nonwork interactions spill over into the workplace and influence organizational culture and norms in remote and hybrid work arrangement compared to fully face to face settings?
- How do fully remote organizations manage expectations of constant connectivity? What does it mean to have 'downtime' in the digital era of 24/7 availability?
- What are the implications of remote and hybrid work for work-nonwork boundaries over time?
- What new types of leader and employee skills and capabilities are needed to facilitate effective work and life relationships in the Remote and Hybrid Work Era?
- How does remote and hybrid work influence the ability to detach from work, and attention spans, and the ability to turn work (or family) off to focus on contrasting roles?

Remote and Hybrid Work and Equality.

- To what extent do remote and hybrid work designs increase or decrease inequality at work?
- How can new work designs be more equitable and inclusive?
- How do algorithmic systems lead to – or help overcome – bias and inequities among women and marginalized groups in the remote and hybrid workplace?
- Can the growing digitalization and the datafication of work allow for the development of new work designs that enable greater time and location flexibility for traditional location-tethered frontline workers who are often left behind?
- What contextual factors at different levels (e.g., group, organization, industry, country) influence inequalities in remote and hybrid work for different employee groups?
- What are the career consequences of being a heavy users of remote and hybrid work?

Instructions for Authors

We encourage scholarly submissions addressing these questions, or any other aspects of remote and hybrid work aligned with *Organizational Science*'s mission and audience. This includes fundamental research about organizations and their processes, structures, strategies, economics, technologies, identities, forms, social purpose, and people. We encourage authors to consider the [Organization Science editorial statement](#) with its inclusion of fields and disciplines indicated above. As noted in the editorial statement, above on the scope of the special issue, we are receptive to a broad range of theoretical perspectives and particularly value papers that connect them. Submissions only examining individual-level phenomenon, without considering at least one aspect

of their relationship to their group/team, organizational or the societal context in which they are embedded are less likely to be a fit for this special issue. Similarly, if macro-economic factors are considered, such papers should also consider linkages to individuals, work groups, organizations, or workplace policy.

We do not have a quota on the number of articles we can accept for the issue. Given it is not a “tournament” or zero-sum game and the focused expertise of submitting authors, authors are expected to accept an invitation to review at least one special issue submission. We also invite authors to publicize this call across their broad networks. Authors should submit papers to the special issue between November 1, 2024- July 15, 2025 or earlier to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/orgsci>. For questions on the special issue, please reach out to any of the special issue editors.

References

- Andrews, K. (2024), Sept. 7. The full costs of telling people to work from home are only now becoming clear. <https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/full-costs-telling-people-work-home-are-onlynow/docview/3101527577/se-2?accountid=13360>
- Bailey, D. E., Faraj, S., Hinds, P. J., Leonardi, P. M., & von Krogh, G. (2022). We are all theorists of technology now: A relational perspective on emerging technology and organizing. *Organization Science* 33(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.1562>
- Blay, T., Froese, F. J., Taras, V., & Gunkel, M. (2023). Convergence of collaborative behavior in virtual teams: The role of external crises and implications for performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0001133>
- Bloom, N, Han., R., Liang, J. (2024). Hybrid working from home improves retention without damaging performance. *Nature*, 63: 920-925.
- Calderon-Monge E., & Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (2023). The role of digitalization in business and management: A systematic literature review. *Review of Managerial Science*, 1–43. [doi:10.1007/s11846-023-00647-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00647-8)
- Callen, A., Bechky, B. & Fayard, A. (2023). Collaborating” with AI: Taking a system view to explore the future of work. *Organization Science*, 34:5: 1672-1694. <https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/orsc.2022.1651>
- DeSanctis, G., & Monge, P. (1999). Introduction to the special issue: Communication processes for virtual organizations. *Organization science*, 10 (6), 693-703.
- Dragano, N., & Lunau, T. (2020). Technostress at work and mental health: Concepts and research results. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 33(4), 407–413. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/10.1097/YCO.0000000000000613>
- Edwards, R. C. 1979. *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*, NY: Basic Books

- Fulk, J., & DeSanctis, G. (1995). Electronic communication and changing organizational forms. *Organization science*, 6(4), 337-349.
- Gajendran, R. S., Ponnappalli, A. R., Wang, C., & Javalagi, A. A. (2024). A dual pathway model of remote work intensity: A meta-analysis of its simultaneous positive and negative effects. *Personnel Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12641>
- Gibbs, M., Mengel, F. & Siemroth, C. Employee innovation during office work, work from home and hybrid work. *Sci Rep* 14, 17117 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-67122-6>
- Gurchiek, (2024, Feb. 1). Remote workers more likely to be laid off. Alexandria, VA: SHRM.org. <https://www.shrm.org/topics-tools/news/employee-relations/remote-workers-layoffs1>
- Gradillas, Maria, & L. D. W. Thomas. 2023. Distinguishing digitization and digitalization: A systematic review and conceptual framework. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12690>
- Hill, N. S., Axtell, C., Raghuram, S., & Nurmi, N. (2022). Unpacking virtual work’s dual effects on employee well-being: An integrative review and future research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 014920632211315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221131535>
- Kossek, E. E., Dumas, T. L., Piszczek, M. M., & Allen, T. D. (2021). Pushing the boundaries: A qualitative study of how stem women adapted to disrupted work–nonwork boundaries during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(11), 1615–1629. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000982>
- Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. A. (2018). Work–life flexibility for whom? Occupational status and work–life inequality in upper, middle, and lower level jobs. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 5–36. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0059>
- Kossek, E.E., & Lee, K. (2020). The coronavirus & work–life inequality: Three evidence-based initiatives to update U.S. work–life employment policies. *Behavioral Science & Policy* 6(2), 77-85. <https://doi.org/10.1353/bsp.2020.0018>.
- Kossek, E. E., Perrigino, M. B., & Lautsch, B. A. (2023). Work-life flexibility policies from a boundary control and implementation perspective: A review and research framework. *Journal of Management*, 49(6), 2062-2108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221140354>
- Lambert, S. J. (2008). Passing the buck: Labor flexibility practices that transfer risk onto hourly workers. *Human Relations*, 61(9), 1203–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708094910>
- Lee, K. (2023). Working from home as an economic and social change: A review. *Labour Economics*, 85: 102462, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2023.102462>
- Leonardi, P. M., & Treem, J. W. (2020). Behavioral visibility: A new paradigm for organization studies in the age of digitization, digitalization, and datafication. *Organization Studies*, 41(12), 1601-1625. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620970728>

- Perrigino, M. B., Dunford, B. B., & Wilson, K. S. (2018). Work–family backlash: The "dark side" of work–life balance (WLB) policies. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), 600–630. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0077>
- Raghuram, S., Hill, N. S., Gibbs, J. L., & Maruping, L. M. (2019). Virtual work: Bridging research clusters. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 308-341. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2017.0020>
- Stanko, T. L., & Beckman, C. M. (2015). Watching you watching me: Boundary control and capturing attention in the context of ubiquitous technology use. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(3), 712–738. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0911>
- Teubner, R. A. & Stockhinger, J.(2020). Literature review: Understanding information systems strategy in the digital age. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 29 (4): 101642, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2020.101642>
- Villamor, I., Hill, N. S., Kossek, E. E., & Foley, K. 2023. Virtuality at work: A double-edged sword for women's career equality. *Academy of Management Annals*, 17(1), 113-140. [DOI:10.5465/annals.2020.0384](https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0384)
- Westfall, Chris, 2023, October. Amazon Empowers managers to fire workers how won't return to the office. *Forbes*, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/chriswestfall/2023/10/23/amazon-empowers-managers-to-fire-employees-who-wont-return-to-office/?sh=738744ca159d>
- Yang, L., Holtz, D., Jaffe, S. *et al.* The effects of remote work on collaboration among information workers. *Nature & Human Behavior* 6, 43–54 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01196-4>
- Zammuto, R. F., Griffith, T. L., Majchrzak, A., Dougherty, D. J., & Faraj, S. (2007). Information technology and the changing fabric of organization. *Organization science*, 18(5), 749-762.

Biographies

Ellen Ernst Kossek is the Basil S. Turner Distinguished Professor of Management at Purdue University. Her research focuses on workplace flexibility (remote work, telework) work-life boundaries, interventions, and gender equality, published in journals including *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *AOM Annals*, and *Personnel Psychology*. Associate Editorial board service includes: *JAP*, *Human Relations*, and *Human Resource Management*. Kossek received her Ph.D. from Yale University, and is a Fellow of the Academy of Management, APA, and Society of I-O Psychology.

Bradley J. Alge is an Associate Professor of Business at Purdue University. He studies organizational control and hybrid work, publishing in journals including the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organization Science*, *Personnel Psychology*, and *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. Editorial board service includes *Academy of Management Review* and *Journal of Management*. Dr. Alge received his Ph.D. in Business from Ohio State University,

MBA from Kent State, and BBA from the University of Notre Dame.

Jennifer L. Gibbs is Professor of Communication at the University of California, Santa Barbara, with an affiliated appointment in Technology Management (TM). Her research examines communication in global, remote, distributed, and hybrid work arrangements. Her work has been published in journals including *Administrative Science Quarterly* and *Organization Science*. Gibbs is a Fellow of the International Communication Association and former Editor of *Communication Research*. She received her PhD in organizational communication from the University of Southern California.

Terri L. Griffith holds the Keith Beedie Chair in Innovation and Entrepreneurship at Simon Fraser University's Beedie School of Business. Her research focuses on bottom-up applications of automation and AI, especially as applied in remote and hybrid work strategies. Griffith's work is published in journals including *Organization Science*, *MIS Quarterly*, and the *Academy of Management Review*. She has served as senior editor for *Organization Science* and associate editor for *MIS Quarterly*. Griffith received her BA from the University of California, Berkeley, and her MS and PhD from Carnegie Mellon University.

N. Sharon Hill is Professor of Management at the George Washington University. She studies virtual/remote work arrangements (e.g., virtual teams, telecommuting, hybrid work), focusing on collaboration, leadership, gender equality, and well-being in these settings. She serves on the editorial boards of *Personnel Psychology* and *Organization Science*, and her research has been published in journals including *Organization Science*, *Academy of Management Annals*, *Personnel Psychology*, and *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. Dr. Hill received her Ph.D. in Management from the University of Maryland, College Park.

Alan Benson is an associate professor in the Work and Organizations Group at the University of Minnesota's Carlson School of Management. His research on hiring, promotions, performance evaluations, and compensation has been published in *QJE*, *ReStud*, *JOLE*, *AMJ*, *ASR*, *SMJ*, *Organization Science*, *Management Science*, and the *ILR Review*. He is currently Senior Editor at *Organization Science* and an Associate Editor at the *ILR Review*. He holds a PhD in Management from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Appendix: Editorial Team and Review Process

Special Issue Editorial Team

Lead Editor

Ellen Ernst Kossek, Purdue University

Associate Editors (in alphabetical order)

- Bradley J. Alge, Purdue University
 - Jennifer L. Gibbs, University of California, Santa Barbara
 - Terri L. Griffith, Simon Fraser University
 - N. Sharon Hill, George Washington University
-
- Alan Benson, University of Minnesota (*Organization Science*, Senior Editor)

Special Issue Decision-Making Process

- Submitted papers are not competing against one another for limited publication slots in the Special Issue (SI). Papers will be evaluated and accepted based on their own merit alone, without any comparisons or rankings of papers relative to each other.
- The lead editor (LE), and other SI editorial team members who will assist as deputy editors, as needed, will make initial decisions on desk rejects and editor review assignments. To preserve reviewer resources, some papers will be desk-rejected for fit or when the LE assesses them as unlikely to meet the standards for publication within two rounds of revision.
- Authors can request a preferred SI-AE to handle their paper, which the LE will honor when possible but will also distribute papers in a manner that balances the workload across editorial team members.
- Theory-enhancing studies will be considered for publication in the special issue, which means that papers do not need to build a new theory to be accepted. Instead, they can help clarify or deepen our understanding of an existing theory.
- Special Issue Editorial Team members will not submit their own papers, except for an introduction to the special issue which they will co-author.
- The LE will process and distribute submissions to the editorial team on a rolling basis to expedite special issue completion.
- All authors submitting manuscripts for the Special Issue that pass an initial screening and are sent out for review are expected to serve as reviewers on at least one other paper under consideration for the Special Issue if requested. We will ensure that SI authors understand that the review process is not a zero-sum game, and that we do not want to see competitive behavior among reviewers. We will ensure that we follow all guidelines to avoid conflicts of interest in making review assignments.
- Each member of the Editorial Team will have autonomy in making decisions on the manuscripts they are assigned. All editors will consult with each other openly about any questions on a paper and solicit advice in handling various issues.
- The LE will remain informed about the status and outlook of papers under review as they progress through the process and with input from other AEs and the CE will review decisions that have gone out to ensure consistency in standards and process. The team will confer periodically to monitor progress on the SI overall and share updates and information to help the team stay on track.
- We will be amenable to granting one-to-two-week extensions to all authors who request one; for those working on revisions, longer extensions may be considered based on their individual circumstances.
- We will do everything we can to meet the 85-day window between the date of submission of a manuscript and the time of decision.
- We are committed to minimizing the chances of “Reject” decisions beyond the first round of review. The majority of manuscripts being invited for revision will have a clear path toward publication going into the second round; almost no authors will proceed to a third review round if more than a “minor revision” is required.
- If a paper goes out for review for the SI, and is rejected, it cannot be resubmitted for consideration for a regular issue of Organization Science. If a paper is desk-rejected for the SI, then authors can submit it subsequently for consideration in the regular review process.
- Unanimity in judgment among reviewers is not required to accept a paper (and does not

dictate a decision even when reviewers are unanimous). Final decisions are solely the discretion of the Special Issue Editors. We will make decisions based on our own manuscript evaluation, informed by reviewers' input.