



ALO! DOŠAO U POSED VRLO SUMINJIVE DOKTORSKE DISERTACIJE FUNKCIONERKE SZS Rektorko, a da proverite i Anin doktorat?!

AUTOR: alo.rs DATUM I VREME: 27.11.2019. 11:01

[36 Komentara](#)

To mogu samo Đilasovi puleni - vlasnica u najmanju ruku sumnjivog doktorata proziva druge da su plagijatori!



Ana Stevanović, Foto: Tanjug Sava Radovanovic

Ana Stevanović, članica Predsedništva SPP-a Dragana Đilasa, koja ovih dana bez prestanka optužuje pojedine članove Vlade da su plagijatori i poziva ih da hitno podnesu ostavku, i sama, prema rečima naših sagovornika, ali i izvora iz akademskih krugova, ima spornu doktorsku disertaciju.

U tom radu, sudeći po delu u koji su naši sagovornici imali uvid, postoje pasusi koji su bukvalno prepisani iz nekih drugih naučnih dela, a da izvor nije naveden... Stevanovićevo je, inače, doktorirala na Fakultetu dramskih umetnosti u Beogradu 2015. godine, a doktorska disertacija nosi naziv „Kreativnost menadžera i uticaj na organizacione inovacije ustanova kulture“. Mentor joj je bila profesorka Tijana Mandić.

Stevanovićevo, koja se skupštinske klupe dočepala zahvaljujući tome što je bila na listi Saše Radulovića, kod Đilasa je preletela kada je on formirao stranku i odmah dobila veoma bitnu

stranačku funkciju. Zanimljivo je da je fotelju u istoj stranci tada dobila i profesorka Tijana Mandić, koja takođe ovih dana optužuje pojedine ministre da su plagijatori...

Mario Spasić, generalni sekretar Saveta za monitoring, ljudska prava i borbu protiv korupcije „Transparentnost“, naglašava da je veoma važno da principi akademske čestitosti važe baš za svakog, pa tako i za Đilasove sledbenike, a u doktoratu Ane Stevanović, tvrdi, ima elemenata plagijata...



Mario Spasić, Foto: Privatna arhiva

- Ja sam imao tu čast da tokom jednog perioda budem član Nacionalnog saveta za visoko obrazovanje Republike Srbije, gde smo tada zaključivali da sporan doktorat jeste onaj koji ima elemente prepisivanja tuđe intelektualne svojine. Uvidom u doktorat Ane Stevanović najpre smo videli da joj je mentor bila politička koleginica, članica Predsedništva Đilasove partije Tijana Mandić. Dalje, utvrdili smo da su neki delovi prepisani iz nekih drugih originalnih naučnih dela, što predstavlja plagiranje. Imajući u vidu da se BU svrstao na jednu stranu i da se odluke donose tako što se nekolicina nezadovoljnih okupi ispred Rektorata, u Aninom slučaju ima potrebe da se isti preispita i da se nezadovoljni građani okupe ispred Rektorata. Rektorka Popović pokazala je opasnu stvar, a to je da se odluke o akademskoj ne čestitosti donose pod pritiskom i otvorila je Pandorinu kutiju. Potpuno je opravдан i s aspekta akademskog integriteta odličan predlog da se digitalizuju svi doktorati i da onda budu dostupni za plagijat-analizu. Videćemo da li će rektorka Popović prihvati ovaj Vučićev predlog i time pokazati da ne radi za Đilasa i društvo - kaže Spasić za „Alo!“.

Poslanik vladajuće većine Marijan Rističević takođe smatra da je doktorat Stevanovićeve veoma sumnjiv, te da mora biti ispitan...



Marijan Rističević, Foto: ALO foto Dejan Briza

- Još davno sam predlagao da svaki magistar i doktor nauka dokaže svoje akademsko zvanje tako što će polagati prijemni za svoj fakultet. Po onome što sam video i čuo o njenom doktoratu, imam pravo da ozbiljno sumnjam u taj radu. Vrlo je sve to tanušno, pa bi i te kako trebalo proveriti, mada sam uveren da rektorki BU ne pada na pamet da to radi - navodi Rističević, podsećajući da je „o gospodjici Ani Stevanović više puta govorio u Skupštini i zbog nekih drugih stvari“.

- Dokazao sam da je do poslaničkog mesta došla zahvaljujući tome što joj majka radi u Agenciji za borbu protiv korupcije. Ona je pomogla da njen tadašnji lider Saša Radulović ne bude predmet pažnje Agencije. Zahvaljujući njoj i njenoj mami, Radulović je vrlo lako mogao da pristupa svim našim podacima kojima raspolaže agencija, a koji nisu javni. Sada Đilas kao tada Radulović zbog Stevanoviće ima na tacni sve naše podatke - tvrdi Rističević.

L. UVOD

S obzirom da se kreativnost posmatra kao "zlatni standard" kojim organizacijama moraju da poseduju ili da tele kako bi njihove organizacije uspele u kompetitivnom okruženju (Jung, Chow & Wu, 2003), istraživači su se posvetili razumevanju faktora i mehanizama koji unapređuju ili inhibiraju kreativnost (Shalley, Zhou & Oldham, 2004). Stajr i Sandgren (2005:68) su na osnovu ovog istraživanja označili pet glavnih organizacionih faktora koji utiču na kreativnost u organizacionim sistemima. Naučnici tvrde da ovi faktori kreiraju uslove za kreativnost na grupnom i individualnom nivou (Woodman et al. 1993). Iako su mnoge studije pokušale su da predstave teorije organizacione kreativnosti, ali iskustva s primenom ove modela su i dalje oskudne.

1. Leading for creativity: Functions, models, and domains

Michael D. Mumford, Sven Hemlin, and Tyler J. Mulhearn

The rapid pace of technological change, the increased pressure of competitive intensity, and globalization of competition, products, and services have had a noteworthy impact on firms across the world. These forces have conspired to place a new premium on innovation (Dess & Pickens, 2000; Mumford & Hunter, 2005). Indeed, the success of firms such as Disney, General Electric, IBM, Apple, and Intel has long been linked to their ability to develop and field innovative new products and services. Today, however, even firms once considered not especially innovative have found their success and survival to depend on creativity and innovation – consider, for example, General Motors. Other firms working in fields never considered especially creative have become successful as a result of innovation – for example, Walmart in retail or Waste Management in disposal systems.

The ability of these firms to produce innovative new products and services, however, ultimately depends on the ability of the firm to manage and stimulate creative thinking on the part of its employees (Amabile, 1996; Dents & Hemlin, 2012; Eisenbeiss, van Knippenberg, & Boerner, 2008). Creative thinking at work, however, is influenced by many variables. For example, people's expertise is a crucial influence on their ability to do creative work (Weisberg & Hass, 2007). The way people work with expertise to produce innovative problem-solutions, how they define problems, combine extant concepts, and generate ideas is also of real importance (Barrett, Vessey, Griffith, Mracek, & Mumford, 2014; Hemlin & Olsson, 2011; Mumford, Medeiros, & Partlow, 2012). Creative people, moreover, must evidence an open, autonomous work style. And, given the risks of creative work, they must evidence a sense of self-efficacy – creative self-efficacy (Tierney, Farmer, & Graen, 1999).

Creative work, however, is not simply a matter of people's capacity, style, and motivation. Creative work, like all other work, occurs in an organizational context – sometimes in a formal organizational context, in a firm, and at other times, in a less formal, professional context. What is of note here, however, is that the organizational context is a powerful force shaping the nature and success of creative efforts (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). The success of creative efforts and people's willingness to make the substantial investments required in most creative efforts depends, in part, on their appraisal of available resources (Nohria & Gulati, 1996). It depends on the processes by which work is accomplished⁷ in the firm (Hülsbeger, Anderson, & Salgado, 2009). It depends on how firms structure⁶ themselves (Damancour & Schneider, 2006). It depends on how firms structure communication and interpersonal exchange (Bauer, 2012). And, it depends on people's perception of the support for creativity evident in their immediate work environment (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron, 1996).

We do not wish to dispute the importance of these, and a number of other variables that act to influence creativity in organizational settings. However, one variable has been

found to be of special significance (Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, & Schmedemann, 2005): employee creativity is somewhat more likely to occur in the presence of a leader of a firm, or a team group, than in the absence of a leader. This may be in our attempts to understand the evidence accrued in many studies that link leadership to the success of creative efforts.

For example, Pelz and Atwater (1993) found that leader technical competence correlated ($r \approx 0.30$) to product development teams and found a positive correlation between leader technical competence and the innovation, productivity, and quality of work of 94 research and development teams. Leader technical competence was positively correlated with leader technical competence, the team. It was found that leader technical competence correlated – positively correlated with leader technical competence, another study, Barnowe (1975) found that leader technical competence in 81 teams. Leader technical competence, leader technical competence, and leader technical competence were assessed in terms of technical skill, support, structure, and measures of performance.

More recent studies have found that leader behavior has an impact on creativity. Min, and Cha (1999), in a study of 100 Korean companies, found that leader behavior was positively related to performance and strategic planning. Tierney, Farmer, and Graen (1999) found that leader behavior was positively related to innovation, and more notably, to invention. Leader-member exchange was positively related to innovation. Keller (2006) examined the relationship between leader-member exchange and structuring behavior on the part of leaders and speed to market of the products of 100 teams. It was found that both leader-member exchange and speed to market were positively – strongly positively related to innovation. Creative efforts – producing creative work – were positively related to leader-member exchange and speed to market of the products of the teams. Carmeli, Reiter-Palmon, and Hennessy (2003) found that leader-member exchange influences the engagement of employees in creative work and the level of psychological safety.

Although other studies might find different results, there are two main conclusions. First, leaders are not just important, they are critical to success. Second, leaders have a big impact – an impact in the form of their behavior and their influence on others. This may be the most powerful influence on creativity.

Second, these effects do not just come from the leader's behavior. They also come from the way that leaders influence the perceptions of their followers.

je u prenosu progovorila uličarskim jezikom. - Ma, terajte se svi u ku*ac - poluglasno je rekla poslanica, ali su je ipak svi čuli.