

Dear Reader,

Welcome to the first edition of JEEMS in 2011. We are very pleased to introduce this edition, because it is a special issue on “**Conflicts, frictions and paradoxes in CEE Management**”. This theme was the topic of the Chemnitz Eastforum in September 2009. From all of the conference submission few articles addressed the topic of conflicts and paradoxes directly and critically. Three papers and one research note, included in this special issue, present a particular look at the conflicts, frictions and paradoxes of management in CEE countries based on the different foci of their analysis.

The articles cover a wide range of topics, like knowledge transfer, organizational change and enterprise transformation and change in the industry, respective the rural agrarian sector, including the special situation of cooperatives and the state and development of management competencies. They address the situation in countries like Russia, Poland, Hungary, Slovenia, and East Germany. Based on different theoretical concepts like institutionalism, organizational learning, principal-agent approach or concepts of knowledge transfer, subsidiary evolution, the theory of cooperation, and the concept of competency management, the authors have also used different methodologies, namely, qualitative in-depth case studies, illustrative cases, panel analysis of enterprise data and questionnaires.

Independent of theories, methodologies and special focus, the collections overviews a number of the various problems connected with the establishment of an East European Capitalism which have followed the narrow transformation period.

The first article by *Victoria Golikova* (Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Russia), *Päivi Karhunen*, and *Riitta Kosonen* (Aalto University School of Economics in Helsinki, Finland) present a rich and fascinating case study which addresses the knowledge transfer between a finish headquarter company and its subsidiary in Russia. Drawing on the subsidiary evolution model by Birkinshaw and Hood (1998), the authors show very convincingly how subsidiary capabilities are evolving over time as a combination of the headquarters' and local knowledge of subsidiary management, such as good personal relations with relevant stakeholders. Thus, the subsidiary shouldn't be considered only as knowledge receiver but also as a transmitter of knowledge to headquarters. Furthermore, Victoria Golikova, Päivi Karhunen and Riitta Kosonen demonstrate in their case study that in the context of globalization, local knowledge becomes even more important than ever.

The second article by *Bruno Grancelli* (University of Trento, Italy) is an instructive analytical study focusing upon the agrarian transformation in Hungary and Poland and points to its main paradoxes. The author draws on the specificities of cooperative management in a post-socialist context, looks at the

relationship processes between big coops and rural farmers and provides a lot of insights regarding the lack of social cooperativeness and associational forms of rural management in CEE countries.

The third paper written by *Michael Wyrwich and Ina Krause* (University of Bielefeld, Germany) addresses the organizational change in the former East Germany. Drawing on the perspective of organizational learning and the so called “imprinting thesis”, the authors assume that the institutional embeddedness of organizations in one political system (central planned economy) can hinder their adaptation in the new system (market economy). In their methodologically demanding empirical study, the authors analyze data from 211 firms in East Germany, ‘survivors’ of the economical transition, and show that firms founded in the late phase of German Democratic Republic (after 1970) have worse growth prospects even until now than firms founded earlier or after German reunification.

The research note by *Jürgen Mühlbacher, Michaela Nettekoven* (WU Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria) and *Jure Kovac* (University of Maribor, Slovenia) adds to the geographically diversity of the special issue as it presents an empirical research from Slovenia. Here, managers in Slovenia were asked about what management competencies they consider as necessary at present and in the future as well as what factors they see as influencing competencies. The results of this explorative study show a clear relevance of methodological competencies, followed by leadership and social-communicative competencies, whereas personal and self-dispositive competencies seem to be considered as least important. In the light of rising importance of self-reflection, as discussed in global leadership research for example, the last result is rather astonishing and deserves further research.

We wish you insightful hours on paradoxes of the management in transforming contexts!

*Irma Rybnikova, Rainhart Lang*  
*Guest Editors*

### **Erratum**

Due to a problem in the handling of the final editorial process, some unfortunate mistakes occurred on the front page of the article “Corporate managers and their potential younger successor: An examination of their values” authored by Katarina Katja Mihelič and Bogdan Lipičnik (e.g., incorrect spelling of first author’s name, wrong email address).

The Editorial Committee apologizes for these mistakes and for any problems that may have resulted!

A corrected version of the front page of this article is now available on the JEEMS homepage.

## Editorial Statistics 2010

Papers submitted 55

Of those papers were:

- rejected by editorial decision 12
- handed back to authors for revision (by editorial decision) 17
- altered to Research Notes 6
- submitted to double-blind review 23
- rejected by unanimous reviewer decision 2
- Rejection rate: 25%
- withdrawn by the authors --
- accepted for publication after revision 11
- published as Articles in 2010 1
- published as Research Notes in 2010 4
- scheduled to be published in 2011 6

Average feedback duration  
(i.e. time between submission of a paper and feedback): 45 days

Feedback loops of more than 100 days  
(Editorial committee target line): 10

Reviews provided: 70

We would like to thank the following reviewers for their co-operation and support provided to our journal (and to the paper submitters) through their critical and fair reviews in 2009:

Maike Andresen	Pieter Jansen
Gyula Bakacsi	Jure Kovac
Karoly Balaton	Kari Liuhto
Grzegorz Belz	Shyqyri Llaci
Nicolae Bibu	Ralph-Elmar Lungwitz
Katharina Bluhm	Csaba Mako
Dorota Joanna Bourne	Milan Maly
Markus Braun	Wolfgang Mayrhofer
Doina Catana	Jean-Pierre Neveu

Tomaž Čater	Raimo Nurmi
Irem Demirkan	Aleksy Poczowski
Evelyn Dietrich	Theo Postma
Eckhard Dittrich	Danijel Pucko
Wolfgang Dorow	Sheila Puffer
John Erpenbeck	Anna Remisova
Jan Hendrik Fisch	Mitja Ruzzier
Bruno Grancelli	Tobias Specker
Igor Gurkov	Christo Stojanov
Niels Hermes	Dieter Wagner
Graham Hollinshead	Peter Wald
Dirk Holtbrügge	Ingo Winkler
Steffen Jahn	Bruno Završnik

Editorial Committee

Rainhart Lang

Thomas Steger

Irma Rybnikova