

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 Çekmecelioğlu* 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!

Mirosava 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 Mitrovic, 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 Bakacsi	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
 Zoltan Buzady
 Doina Catana
 Tomaz Čater
 Nevenka Černigoj Sadar
 Ed Clark
 Sven-Olof Collin
 Bruno Dallago
 Eckhard Dittrich
 Claudia Doblinger
 Gregor Dorfleitner
 Christoph Dörrenbächer
 Michael Dowling
 Vince Edwards
 John Erpenbeck
 Marion Festing
 Jan Hendrik Fisch
 Peter Fischer
 Anja Geigenmüller
 Mario Glowik
 Victoria Golikova
 Igor Gurkov
 Sebastian Händschke
 Nadine Heckmann
 Balázs Heidrich
 Roland Helm
 Joachim Hentze
 Niels Hermes
 Alessandro Hinna
 Nigel Holden
 Graham Hollinshead
 Harald Hruschka
 Stefan Hüsigg
 Akihiro Ishikawa
 Steffen Jahn
 Andreja Jaklič
 Björn Jindra
 Stephan Kaiser
 Mirjana Kljajic

Wolfgang Mayrhofer
 Dmitri Melkumov
 Dirk Morschett
 Regina Mulder
 Jean-Pierre Neveu
 Ivan Novy
 Raimo Nurmi
 Simon Oertel
 Andrei Panibratov
 Claudia Petrescu
 Evgeny Polyakov
 Aleksy Pochtowski
 Theo Postma
 Danijel Pucko
 Sheila Puffer
 Lukasz Puslecki
 Philipp Ramin
 Anna Remisova
 Björn Röber
 Katja Rost
 Ihar Sahakiants
 Frederic Schmetzer
 Stefan Schmid
 Arnold Schuh
 Tobias Specker
 Christo Stojanov
 Thomas Straub
 Erna Szabo
 Till Talaulicar
 Norbert Thom
 Piotr Trąpczyński
 Deniz Tunçalp
 Dieter Wagner
 Peter Wald
 Peter Walgenbach
 Axel Walther
 Aleksandra Wąsowska
 Elke Weik
 Sibel Yamak

Editorial Committee
 Irma Rybnikova

Thomas Steger

Rainhart Lang