

Editorial

Dear readers,

first issue of JEEMS in 2016 turns out as quite psychologically framed since topics raised as well as theoretical perspectives considered - like psychological empowerment, cognitive styles, managerial decision making or work alienation - remember master course in organizational psychology than "hard core" economics. This is by no way surprising given the fact that management belongs to the disciplines where the plurality of disciplines is not only a rhetoric strategy. At the same time, psychological dominance is in fact welcome given the complex and complicated geo-political and economic situation in Europe at the outset of 2016. In terms of countries covered by the articles included in this issue, a clear tendency of JEEMS as well as management research from the East European region towards the "East" can be stated: the four articles stem either from the Serbian or from the Turkish context. With its recent geographic scope, JEEMS seems to outperform the European Union to a considerable degree.

The article by *Hülya Gündüz Çekmecelioglu* and *Gönül Kaya Özbağ* (Kocaeli University, Turkey) deals with innovation phenomena from the perspective of psychological empowerment. The authors ask whether psychological empowerment of employees is able to positively influence their individual innovativeness as well as the innovativeness of the firm. The quantitative results gathered from 48 Turkish manufacturing companies provide support for predicted relationship: all dimensions of psychological empowerment of employees have significant effects on individual and organizational innovativeness. Freedom and power of employees at the workplace pay off!

Miroslava Đurišić-Bojanović (University of Belgrade, Serbia) tackles in her article with the issue of organizational change. In particular the author asks if there is a relationship between the cognitive style of employees and their responses to organizational change (openness to change versus resistance to it). In fact, the study conducted in two companies in Serbian show that there is a strong link between the variables studied. The individual attitude toward change in organizations can be traced back to dispositional parameters, such as individual cognitive style. As a result, it seems to be quite challenging to change resistance to change once you or we have an unfavourable cognitive style, like low acceptance of plurality or inflexible, dogmatic cognitive style. Whether this is the whole story of resistance to change, still remains open. And at the time of recent political instability and the so called "crisis of refugees" we should hope that the most European people are equipped with flexible cognitive styles or at least with openness to change them.

The next paper is written by *Başak Uçanok Tan* (Istanbul Bilgi University, Turkey) deals with classical issue of organizational sociology, work alienation. In his study, the author elaborates the triangle between work alienation, organisa-

tional commitment and work centrality in Turkish SMEs while asking when work alienation does not lead to reduced commitment at work. The quantitative results obtained from a cross-sectional study show that it has to do with work centrality. Generally speaking, with increasing work centrality the negative effect of work alienation on affective commitment decreases. Thus, the impact of work alienation seems to be much more complex than proposed by Marx.

The last article of this issue provided by *Leposava Grubic-Nesic, Slavica Mitravic, Boban Melovic and Stevan Milisavljevic* (University of Novi Sad, Serbia, and University of Montenegro) focuses on decision making by managers. The authors compare organizations in public and private sectors which both are undergoing times of radical changes while looking for relevant factors that affect decision making. It turns out that the process of decision making is mostly influenced by demographic characteristics of managers, such as career progress and hierarchical level, kind of decisions made – if they are risky or rational, the industrial sector of organization, with manufacturing being different from service industry. Whether organization belongs to public or to private sector seems to make a difference as well. At the end, decision making in organizations does not lose its reputation as highly complex, ambivalent and barely predictable phenomenon.

I wish you an inspiring reading and peaceful year 2016.

Irma Rybnikova

Erratum

In the paper **Impacts of entrepreneurs' stress and family members on SMEs' business success in Serbian family-owned firms**, authored by **Marko M. Mihic, Sinisa M. Arsic, Milos Z. Arsic** (vol. 20, issue 4, 2015, pp. 452-483) the following three paragraphs were omitted in error:

“This paper established a high level of correlation between annual income and annual turnover (0.74 of max. 1); consequently, either of the indicators can be used to present their correlations to other indicators. The first part of the hypothesis can be confirmed or rejected by testing the data relating to success and data relating to the number of family-member employees, while the second part of the hypothesis requires the authors to test data on success and data on the level of entropy in a hierarchy.

H2.1 The success of a family firm is endangered due to a large number of family-member employees

The first auxiliary hypothesis (presented as H2.1) is tested in Table 6, where the authors of this paper presented a Chi-Square test with a critical value of 0.1 (10%), as well as Kendall's tau-b and Gamma test. The authors have established correlation between the two factors, i.e. the tests confirmed that a large number of family-member employees can endanger a company's success measured by annual income and annual turnover.

Table 8 contains the report generated after conducting regression analysis. The regression analysis used to analyze owners' motivation, confirmed that two main factors derived from empirical research experience linear growth in correlation with an increase in the number of family-member employees in the company. These two factors are: job security and profit stays in the family. The correlation coefficient is 0.930 (see Table 8). It is possible to reach a logical conclusion that the owners are motivated to start a business knowing that they have the opportunity to provide job security for their family and keep the profit in the family.”

These paragraphs should be inserted on page 470, right after

“Other indicators of business success, such as firm liquidity, firm solvency, social responsibility, contribution to public health and public well-being, were not a part of the research because owners did not wish to share them with authors or did not know how to express and quantify them.”

The online version of the article has been corrected.

We apologize for this mistake!

Thomas Steger
Editor-in-chief

Editorial Statistics 2015

Papers submitted 168 (+60%)

Of those papers were:

- rejected by editorial decision 88
- handed back to authors for revision (by editorial decision) 32
 - submitted to double-blind review after initial revision 6
 - rejected by editorial decision after initial revision --
 - withdrawn by the authors 4
 - cancelled by editorial decision 1
- altered to Research Notes --
- directly submitted to double-blind review 48
 - rejected by unanimous reviewer decision 4
 - cancelled by editorial decision 1
- Rejection rate: 56%
- withdrawn by the authors 3
- accepted for publication after revision 8
 - published as Articles in 2015 --
 - published as Research Notes in 2015 --
 - scheduled to be published in 2016/2017 8

Average feedback duration

(i.e. time between submission of a paper and feedback): 58 days

Feedback loops of more than 100 days

(Editorial committee target line): 41

Reviews provided: 146

We express our gratitude to the following reviewers for their support provided to our journal through their critical and fair reviews in 2015:

Norbert Bach	Heiko Kohlenbecker
Gyula Bakacs	Jure Kovac
Yannick Bammens	Arjan Kozica
Florian Becker-Ritterspach	Albert Kräh
Christina Beisiegel	Bernhard Laux
Yury Blagov	Kari Liuhto
Danijela Bogdanic	Shyqyri Llaci
Dorota Bourne	Csaba Mako

Markus Braun	Wolfgang Mayrhofer
Zoltan Buzady	Dmitri Melkumov
Doina Catana	Dirk Morschett
Tomaž Čater	Regina Mulder
Nevenka Černigoj Sadar	Jean-Pierre Neveu
Ed Clark	Ivan Novy
Sven-Olof Collin	Raimo Nurmi
Bruno Dallago	Simon Oertel
Eckhard Dittrich	Andrei Panibratov
Claudia Doblinger	Claudia Petrescu
Gregor Dorfleitner	Evgeny Polyakov
Christoph Dörrenbächer	Aleksy Pocztowski
Michael Dowling	Theo Postma
Vince Edwards	Danijel Pucko
John Erpenbeck	Sheila Puffer
Marion Festing	Lukasz Puslecki
Jan Hendrik Fisch	Philipp Ramin
Peter Fischer	Anna Remisova
Anja Geigenmüller	Björn Röber
Mario Glowik	Katja Rost
Victoria Golikova	Ihar Sahakiants
Igor Gurkov	Frederic Schmetzer
Sebastian Händschke	Stefan Schmid
Nadine Heckmann	Arnold Schuh
Balázs Heidrich	Tobias Specker
Roland Helm	Christo Stojanov
Joachim Hentze	Thomas Straub
Niels Hermes	Erna Szabo
Alessandro Hinna	Till Talaulicar
Nigel Holden	Norbert Thom
Graham Hollinshead	Piotr Trąpczyński
Harald Hruschka	Deniz Tunçalp
Stefan Hüsig	Dieter Wagner
Akihiro Ishikawa	Peter Wald
Steffen Jahn	Peter Walgenbach
Andreja Jaklič	Axel Walther
Björn Jindra	Aleksandra Wąsowska
Stephan Kaiser	Elke Weik
Mirjana Kljajic	Sibel Yamak

Editorial Committee

Thomas Steger

Irma Rybnikova

Rainhart Lang