

Comparative international management of human resources and human resources management in Brazil: An analysis in view of the calculative and collaborative models

Tatiani dos Santos Zuppani¹ and André Luiz Fischer

University of São Paulo - USP, São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article history:

Received 11 January 2016

Accepted 28 April 2016

Available online in 31 April 2016

Double Blind Review System

Scientific Editor

Eduardo Eugênio Spers

Keywords:

Comparative International Management of Human Resources; Strategic Human Resources Management; Calculative Model; Collaborative Model

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to analyze the adoption of calculative and collaborative practices dominating comparative international human resources management, according to the different profiles of the areas of Human Resources Management (HRM) of private organizations operating in Brazil. The method employed was a Survey, operated by means of an electronic questionnaire on HRM practices and organizational characteristics. A total of 326 respondents was obtained. Initially a cluster was conducted, in which respondents were clustered into four groups with different HRM profiles. The use of calculative and collaborative practices was compared in the four groups formed through the ANOVA (analysis of variance) collection of statistical models. The main findings showed that the strategic group was the one with the highest average of adoption of calculative and collaborative practices. The Communicative HRM group showed a higher propensity to collaborative practices and the Formalized HRM group would adopt calculative practices, although none of the groups showed an average of adoption than the Strategic HRM group. This suggests that it is necessary to learn how to deal with different aspects of the management of people in organizations operating in Brazil.

© 2016 Internext | ESPM. All rights reserved!

1. Introduction

Managing employees is strongly influenced by contextual and cultural factors of the environment in which the organization is inserted (Croucher, Gooderham, & Parry, 2006; Tanure, Evans, & Caçado, 2010a). This statement makes consistent the progress in the area of Human Resources Management (HRM) from an operational to a more strategic approach. From this perspective, different variables need to be considered, including those related to the context in which the organizations fall. Understanding macro-environmental aspects, therefore, has gained ground and triggered contextualized HRM studies (Brewster, 2004; Kramar, 2012; Peng, 2005), especially in view of the global

competitiveness of organizations and the evolution of International Human Resources Management (IHRM).

Organizations operating in Brazil are influenced by the environment external to them. From the 1990s, with the national economic openness, there were major structural reforms, accompanied by the increasing number of expatriates, transmission of new forms of management disseminated by the business media, consulting companies and business schools (Chu & Wood Jr., 2008) and an increase in the influence of different multinational organizations. In addition, the technology promotes the shortening of distances, and in conjunction with other factors it leverages globalization, which exacerbates the

¹ Corresponding author: Email: tszuppani@gmail.com

competition among organizations, now with competitors around the world, making efficiency an imperative for survival, which depends on the results produced by the organizations' employees and their ability to respond to environmental demands.

This situation has led the organizations' HRM operating in Brazil to change, since they need to adapt to these contextual demands. This aspect enhances the importance of research and development of HRM practices with a more comprehensive view of the area, also seeking to deal with stimuli that go beyond organizational boundaries and, ultimately, to position the characteristics of the area in a global setting. The change of context, therefore, implies a deeper understanding of what the area is in the country, especially in its strategic perspective, which should be closely related to organizational results (Biron, Farndale, & Paauwe, 2011; Boselie, Dietz, & Boon, 2005; Delery & Doty, 1996; Paauwe & Boselie, 2005).

The importance of knowing the institutional environment in which the HRM develops has led several international studies to map these regional characteristics and provide an international comparison. These studies commonly classify the area in two models: calculative and collaborative (Croucher et al., 2006; Gooderham, Nordhaug, & Ringdal, 1999; Poutsma, Ligthart, & Veersma, 2006; Poutsma, Ligthart, Dietz, 2013; Uysal, 2014). The first is prevalent in the United States and Anglo-Saxon countries and the second in European countries (Brewster, 2007b). However, the number of studies that question the national HRM is still incipient, preventing the discussion of systems, strategies and practices in Brazil in an international context, solidifying the knowledge of GIRH (Lazarova, Morley, & Tyson, 2008).

In this sense, the aim of this study is **to analyze the adoption of calculative and collaborative practices dominating comparative international human resources management, according to the different profiles of the areas of Human Resources Management (HRM) of private organizations operating in Brazil**. Therefore, although this study does not promote a comparison of organizations practices present in Brazil with those in other countries, it uses the literature that supports these comparative studies and promotes initial guidelines for research to this end. Furthermore, this research aims to get rid of the focus on case studies that the

country's academic perspective has (Demo, Fogaça, Nunes, Edrei, & Francischeto, 2011; Tonelli, Caldas, Lacombe, & Tinoco, 2003).

This proposal is justified by the potential results that the research can bring to professionals of the area, since it is intended to produce a clearer and empirically proven picture of the HRM in the country. With this, it is possible to take more assertive decisions about the direction that should guide their actions in organizations. Subramony (2006) stands out for this audience by posing as critical function of the area the demonstration of economic values and strategic credibility in order to legitimize the decision-making based on strategic information and not from subjective perceptions.

2. Strategic human resources management

Different definitions of the concept of SHRM have been proposed. For Martín-Alcázar, Romero-Fernández and Sánchez-Gardey (2005, p. 651), the concept is viewed as "the integrated set of practices, policies and strategies through which organizations manage their human capital, which influences and is influenced by the business strategy, the organizational context and the socio-economic context."

Schuler and Jackson (2005), besides discussing the vertical alignment, also recognize the need to integrate the practices of the area, known as horizontal alignment. Therefore, the authors believe it is appropriate to show the effectiveness of the area on the organizational performance and the partnership among HRM professionals and line managers. In this perspective, the integration among the policies of the area also provides the conditions that employees need to achieve the desired expectations (Demo et al., 2011). The prospect of a strategic "partner" gains strength as the horizontal alignment requires a joint effort of other managements and also their own staff, as well as effective communication practices.

Kramar and Parry (2014) are more specific when limiting the HRM characteristics that effectively make it strategic. First, the authors mention the HRM professional role in the organization, which must involve strategic decisions, besides acting jointly with the line managers. They also point out that the performance training and management practices should be directed to the achievement of organizational results. And finally they cite the need

to establish strong relationships with employees and their representatives, including labor unions.

The SHRM is understood in this paper as the set of proposed policies and practices for the management of employees. They are developed and implemented in conjunction with line managers; they are integrated with each other, with the organizational strategy and linked to the company's bottom line. To measure this variable, Kramar and Parry (2014, p. 404) propose:

"The SHRM is formed by three areas: first, the role of the human resources management professional, which includes their participation in the business strategy, the partnership with line managers and the evaluation of the HR function; second, performance and capacity management through evaluation systems, compensation and training based on performance; and thirdly, developing direct relationships with employees through communication and collaboration systems".

This proposal is consistent with other studies in the area of SHRM (Becker, Huselid, & Ulrich, 2001; Boxall & Purcell, 2011; Guest, 1989; Lepak & Shaw, 2008; Schuler, 1992). Thus, it is fully acceptable that the first two definitions involve the work to be developed in the area of HRM to the external environment, for it is only with regard to this point that the organization shall be able to contingently respond to environmental changes that are presented.

However, if the organization is only looking at the external environment and is unable to mobilize in relation to its changes, the vertical alignment shall be ineffective. Therefore, it also needs to promote cohesion between the actions and goals of its own area, which should function as an integrated system in achieving the goals set. The tactic will assist the organization in adopting the most appropriate contingency responses. Therefore, it is vital that the area have representation at the highest organizational level, keep working in partnership with line managers and contribute to the design of the internal capacity.

3. System of an HR comparative international management: The calculative and collaborative models

The analysis of HRM has led some authors to create typologies and categorizations of what is practiced by organizations in the light of different realities in

different countries, regions, industries, and other institutional factors. Therefore, within the scope of this study, Calculative and Collaborative models shall be addressed.

The dichotomy between these proposals has gained prominence in the academic setting with European researchers (Croucher et al., 2006; Gooderham et al., 1999; Poutsma, Ligthart, & Veersma, 2006; Poutsma et al., 2013; Uysal, 2014). Scholars question the effectiveness of people management practices in the way they had been developed in the United States because the European context was considered completely different.

The Collaborative model is more humanistic and uses psychological practices based on agreements between the employees and the company, thus seeking to develop favorable organizational attitudes and behaviors (Uysal, 2014). Therefore, the employees are seen as active participants in business, and communication and cooperation are emphasized, featuring a culture of partnership (Poutsma et al., 2006). For Gooderham et al. (1999), the premise desired with these employees is commitment, communication and collaboration.

The practices of this system occur through the introduction and maintenance of sophisticated human relations strategies. According to Gooderham et al. (1999), collaborative practices are highly dependent on improvement of a less operational perspective, involving managers and experts in HRM.

With this philosophy, the practices of this model involve regular communication, including on strategic, financial and organizational information (Croucher et al., 2006; Gooderham et al., 1999), the use of collective incentives systems (Poutsma et al., 2006) and documentation of the organizational mission and employment policies (Poutsma et al., 2013). Consulting employees is also fairly frequent (Gooderham & Nordhaug, 2010).

Labor unions and other representative bodies generally do not resist to collaborative practices, but may put pressure on the management for the discussions on strategies to occur through channels such as collective bargaining committees and/or agencies. On the other hand, there may be a greater openness among the issues relating to the negotiation and those subject to managerial prerogative, restricting the labor union's participation to an operational aspect. There may

also be legal provisions on information consultation, favoring the discussion of strategic issues by the internal representation bodies (Poutsma et al., 2006).

The Calculative HRM has a rational positioning and is based on the underlying assumption that the use of individual resources aimed at increasing performance levels shall benefit the organization as a whole (Poutsma et al., 2006). Therefore, a close relationship among the employees and organizational strategies is essential.

The focus is on consciously exercising human resources, as each practice used aims at efficient employees' contributions (Gooderham et al., 1999). Croucher et al. (2006) points out that the practices of this system are designed to achieve individual efficiency and concern: individual rewards reviews and systems (Croucher et al., 2006; Gooderham & Nordhaug, 2010; Poutsma et al., 2006), financial participation of employees, for example, including in profits (Croucher, Brookes, Wood, & Brewster, 2010), individual development practices (Gooderham et al., 1999) and formal evaluation of training conducted (Poutsma et al., 2013).

These practices are possible because the organization, in this type of model, treats each employee as an individual and not as a member of a corporate body protected by collective contracts of employment and unionization. They are established by decision of the employer or negotiated between the management and the workers, in private (Poutsma et al., 2006).

However, although there is pressure for the use of HRM practices developed and used in the USA (Brewster, 2007a, 2007b), studies in Comparative Management of Human Resources indicate reasons to avoid this. Even though the USA is still a great influencer of the area, companies seek to adapt their practices to local characteristics. This is the case of Europe, the continent in which research points to the HRM area with very distinct characteristics from the American one.

This differentiation can be expressed through the strategic perspective of HRM prevailing in these societies. Authors consider that the universalist perspective stands out among the Americans and a contextual positioning can be identified among the Europeans (Apospori, Nikandrou, Brewster, & Papalexandris, 2008; Brewster, 2007a, 2007b). This idea is consistent with the proposition by Müller-

Camen (1999), who sees the American literature as more individualistic.

In general, the literature which supports the studies that differentiate the HRM institutional characteristics in Europe and in the USA are based on theories of types of capitalism. The United States, Canada, the UK and Australia are characterized by a liberal market economy, i.e., coordinated primarily by market competitiveness (Bruzzo & Basso, 2012; Parry, Dickmann, & Morley, 2008). In these countries, there is a focus on individualism and the labor unions have little influence on labor relations. Therefore, practices related to performance management and rewards face greater openness (Brookes, Croucher, Fenton-O'Creevy, & Gooderham, 2011).

As for European countries of non-Anglo-Saxon origin (Germany, Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands) coordinated market economies prevail. Therefore, they maintain a more strategic interaction with the government, banks, universities, industry, labor unions and employers' federations. In these countries, there is interference in labor relations, modes of investment activities and corporate governance (Hall & Soskice, 2001; Uysal, 2014; Whitley, 1999).

Therefore, the American HRM model has developed in a less regulated scenario, in which organizations were concerned with measurable results and then sought to determine the most effective practices in obtaining these results. But the European context is completely different. The contextual variables would have much greater weight in the regulation of businesses (Brewster, 2007b). One should take into account that most of the European countries are members of the European Union (EU), which has as a trend to political, economic and social integration, and aims to liberalize the flow of goods, services, people and capital (Mayrhofer, Brewster, Morley, & Ledolter, 2011).

Brewster (2007 b) makes a further study in order to compare the specific characteristics of the area and studies on HRM among these regions. The summarized results of this study are shown in Table 1.

Therefore, it may be seen that the American HRM is more calculative, as it emphasizes the foreign market, individual roles and accountability than the relations established in this context (Brookes et al.,

2011). As for Europe, the most commonly found configuration is collaborative, in which the differences of interests are recognized, but there is an obligation to join the groups by a number of mechanisms, including intensive communication (Gooderham et al., 1999). This means that in the first case, the interest lies on the shareholders, emphasizing the market, while in the second one the interests fall on the stakeholders who need to be addressed, emphasizing their links with businesses.

Tab. 1

Comparing the HRM characteristics among the United States and Europe.

Analysis features	USA	Europe
HR focus	Performance in the company	Company in a context
Literature type	Prescriptive	Critical
Methodological perspective	Deductible	Inductive
Cultural characteristics	Individualistic	More collectivist
Employment legislation	Market self-regulation	Strong State control
Unions	Less unionized	Massive presence

Source: Constructed based on a study by Brewster (2007 b).

Finally, it should be noted that while the Calculative and Collaborative approaches constitute two distinct sets, the HRM practices should not be conceived as representatives of two different ends of a continuum, but as orthogonal (Gooderham et al., 1999), as these models are not opposites and at some time intersect. Rousseau and Arthur (1999) classify these positions as complementary.

Croucher et al. (2006) point out that the choice of one system or another is not exactly by the organizations and their respective areas of personnel management, but a consequence of the influence of the national context and in particular the institutions of the national system of industrial relations. Institutional determinants have a strong effect on the implementation of people management practices in both models (Gooderham et al., 1999).

4. Methodology

A quantitative approach of a cross-sectional nature was used (Babbie, 2001; Malhotra, 2006). The method employed was the survey-type, operated by means of a questionnaire with closed questions dealing on HRM practices and organizational

characteristics, developed by The Cranfield Network on International Human Resources Management (Cranet). It is a network of international research focused on comparing practices in different countries and which simultaneously enables the understanding of local management characteristics.

The questionnaire deals with people management practices and organizational characteristics and underwent the technique of *translation/back-translation* (Cranet, 2011). The choice of this instrument was due to its international academic recognition, as it has been used for years in different research on the people management area (Bruzzo & Basso, 2012; Gooderham & Nordhaug, 2010; Gurkov, Zelenova, & Saidov, 2012; Larsen & Brewster, 2003; Rizov & Croucher, 2009; Stavrou & Kilaniotis, 2010; Supangco, 2012). Moreover, as the aim of this study is also to position the strategic characteristics of HRM identified in an international perspective, the use of an instrument validated and used in other countries would allow more assertive comparisons.

The target population of this study consisted of private companies employing five or more employees in 2014, which was the period of the empirical research, and accessed by a non-probabilistic sampling procedure. The person responsible for completing the questionnaire should be involved in managing people in the company, as they needed to have a broad knowledge of the area.

Initially, five of them participated in a pretest to verify the usability of the Website on which the questionnaire was made available and understand the proposed translation. After the adjustments shown in the pretest, 22,052 e-mails were sent to companies responsible for the people management area with operations in Brazil, and 1,295 (5.9%) organizations responded to the request to participate in the research. However, the amount of 862 participations (66.5% of total respondents) was rejected for not having completed the questionnaire, or because they provided a very high amount of incomplete answers.

That left 433 valid participations. Clearing the database led to the exclusion of all respondents who did not work in the private sector, had fewer than five employees, and institutions that did not have a formal HRM area and therefore did not meet the objectives of this study. Finally, the total sample used to meet the proposed objectives totaled 326 organizations.

The participants' responses were stored in a database and transferred to the SPSS 19.0 (*Statistical Package for Social Sciences*), software used to promote the statistical analysis of the study findings. Initially, a descriptive statistical analysis was conducted (mean, standard deviation and frequency) to characterize the sample. Subsequently, the Human Resources Management in the organizations surveyed was classified into different groups by means of a cluster analysis. Finally, an ANOVA (analysis of variance) collection of statistical models was carried out to study the differences between means of the groups formed in the previous step and the calculative and collaborative practices.

5. Analysis of results

5.1 Sample characterization

The number of employees found among respondents varied from 7 to 100,489. The mean was of 3,387.40 employees but, as a consequence of such a high amplitude, the standard deviation was high (SD = 10,999.19).

Regarding the sector of activity of the companies surveyed, the disaggregated analysis of the data shows a very heterogeneous sample, suggesting contexts, technologies and different audiences. Among the highlights is the predominance of retail and wholesale trades (10.1%), followed by food, drinks, textiles, wood and paper, coke fuel, refined oil manufacturing areas, and related products (8.9%). It is also necessary to highlight the representativeness of the Information Technology (IT) area, with 7.7%. On the other hand, some types of services (accommodation and food, publishing, broadcasting activity), with 0.9%, and manufacturing (computers, electronic and electrical equipment and transport equipment), with 2.4% were underrepresented in the research.

Tab. 2

Distribution of the companies surveyed by continent where the headquarters are located.

Continente	n	%
Asia*	9	3
North America	24	7
Europe	40	12
South America	253	78
Total	326	100

Source: Elaborated from the collection of research data.

Note: n = absolute number of respondents, % = percentage.

*Turkey was included in Asia

Another important characteristic investigated was the continent of the organizational headquarters location, shown in Table 2.

With the exception of Oceania, all other continents are represented in the sample. The smallest number of headquarters belongs to Asia, followed by North America. And most of the 24 references point the headquarters in US territory. In Europe, which includes 12% of the headquarters of the companies surveyed, there was no predominance of any country differently. Finally, although some offices are in South America, most companies (247, 75.8%) characterized in this segment are headquartered in Brazil. In this sense, it is more coherent that the dominance of market performance of these companies is national.

Although not representative of the population, the sample characterization data reveal quite heterogeneous aspects which somehow correspond to the characteristics of the national scene. However, besides characterizing the survey respondents for further expansion of the results achieved, such aspects may influence the management of people in organizations.

As for the Brazilian demographic region in which the company is, it is known that culture, institutional variables and the wealth-producing capacity of the states are different. Consequently, it is expected that efforts in directing the people's behavior at work is also suited to meet regional specificities. The organizational headquarters has implications on the transparency of practices and the search for organizational results, as well as a more strategic positioning in order to stay more competitive.

As for the size of the organization, it can affect different aspects, such as the level of formalization and communication of practices, the professionalization of actions and HRM professionals, and even the distribution of tasks in the area. The business sector is also of fundamental importance for understanding the strategic issues studied. Operating in a more competitive environment, such as in IT, may involve the use of practices more focused on results and valuing people to retain professionals. As for the commodity sectors, the needs can be quite different.

Tab. 3
 Analysis of variance (ANOVA)

Variáveis	Cluster		Error		F	Sig.
	Square Average	GL	Square Average	GL		
1. Role of HR on organizational strategy;	76,506	3	,297	322	258,002	,000
2. Management of the performance and capacity of the labor	57,946	3	,469	322	123,436	,000
3. Relationship with employees and representatives	76,800	3	,294	322	261,414	,000

Source: Elaborated from the collection of research data. **Note:** DL = Degrees of liberty

5.2 Classification of the different profiles of the areas of HRM of private organizations operating in Brazil

Whereas the focus of analysis of this study lies on the different profiles, it was decided to carry out the grouping of the organizations by strategic profile adopted. For this grouping, a cluster analysis was performed from three criteria defended by Kramar and Parry (2014) and previously reported in the literature:

1. Role of HRM on organizational strategy;
2. Management of the organization's employees' performance and capacity;
3. Relations with employees and their representatives.

Testing the internal consistency of indicators proposed for the formation of each variable is believed to be important. Using the Cronbach's alpha test, it was decided to eliminate four sets of items: 1. A joint action between HRM and line managers in decision-making; 2. Mission and organizational strategy written; 3. Proportion of unionized employees; and 4. Extent of the influence of labor unions in the organization. The exclusion of these variables generates a satisfactory result in the reliability test ($\alpha < 0.6$).

After selecting the variables for the analysis of clusters, outliers and multicollinearity were checked.

Tab. 4
 Final distance between the centroids of the clusters formed

Variables	Clusters			
	1	2	3	4
Zscore: Role of HR on organizational strategy	-1,27539	0,83597	0,47816	-0,6565
Zscore: Management of the performance and capacity of the labor	-0,83065	0,92607	0,12846	-0,76508
Zscore: Relationship with employees and representatives	-1,28638	1,01843	-0,3456	0,20846
n	67	102	91	66
%	20,55	31,29	27,91	20,25

Source: Elaborated from the collection of research data.

According to Fávero, Belfiore, Silva, & Chan (2009), *cluster analysis* is a technique that is sensitive to these aspects which, if any, tend to distort the results. As for the *outliers*, no answer or respondent fit in this regard. Multicollinearity was measured by Pearson correlation analysis and although all were significant ($p > 0.001$), none was as highly correlated (coefficient $p > 0.7$), i.e., without overlapping variables.

Having met the prerequisites, the cluster analysis itself was performed by two different cluster methods, though complementary. At first, the Hierarchical Conglomerates Analysis with the Ward analysis method was used, which puts each case as a separate cluster and subsequently goes on making hierarchical sequential combinations of nested groups until including all in a single group (Antonenko, Toy, & Niederhauser, 2012). In this analysis, the Z score method was used for the standardization of measures and the dendrogram to get the best number of clusters.

The best configuration resulted in the formation of four distinct groups. This was the basis for the second analysis, in which a non-hierarchical algorithm (K means) was used for the classification of respondents into four groups. The resulting ANOVA (analysis of variance) of this analysis validated the construction of the proposed groups, and is shown in Table 3.

By the resulting data, it appears that the variables considered influence the separation of groups because all showed $p < 0.001$. Another important factor observed is the statistical value of F, which ranks the variables in the separation process. By the resulting figures, the variable that most contributed to the differentiation of the groups was the relationship with employees, followed by the role of HRM in the organizational strategy and, finally, the management of the employees' performance and capacity. Thus, defining the profile of each cluster formed by evaluating the distance between the centroids of the clusters formed was sought. This result is reported in Tabela 4.

Based on these data, the existence of four strategic groups of HRM in the organizations surveyed was proposed:

1. **Operational HRM:** Low formalization of the HRM practices and organizational integration, little use of formal performance evaluation and little association between results and rewards, strategic communication deficit.
2. **Strategic HRM:** High formalization of HRM practices and organizational integration, frequent use of formal performance evaluation and association between results and rewards, good strategic communication.
3. **Formalized HRM:** Relatively high formalization of the HRM practices and organizational integration, slightly higher use of formal performance evaluation and association between results and rewards, strategic communication deficit.
4. **Communicative HRM:** Relatively low formalization of the HRM practices and organizational integration, little use of formal performance evaluation and little association between results and rewards, relatively good strategic communication.

Clearly, there are still in Brazil companies that have a department focused on people management, but do not maintain connection with an organizational strategy, do not contingently evaluate or reward employees, and also do not achieve an assertive communication, suggesting the existence of a purely bureaucratic and procedural HRM, which really has little to contribute to better results, as they are at most anxious to follow the "manual" of the area.

On the other hand, there is a large number of companies classified in the strategic group, together

Tab. 5 ANOVA test to compare the means of the calculative and collaborative practices among the strategic groups of HRM

Variables	Operational HRM		Strategic HRM		Formalized HRM		Communicative HRM		Total		F	Sig	Post-Hoc Test		
	n	Avg	SD	n	Avg	SD	n	Avg	SD	n				Avg	SD
Calculativo															
Bonus based on goals / individual performance	67	0,492 ^a	,859	102	1,617 ^{ab}	1,211	91	1,021 ^{ab}	1,022	66	0,787 ^b	1,112	18,198	0,000	Games-Howell
Payment linked to individual performance	67	0,432 ^a	,891	102	1,480 ^{ab}	1,340	91	0,857 ^{ab}	1,091	66	0,636 ^b	1,190	14,159	0,000	Games-Howell
Formal performance evaluation	67	1,716 ^a	1,165	102	2,88 ^{ab}	,451	91	2,582 ^{abc}	,731	66	1,727 ^b	1,016	37,056	0,000	Games-Howell
Measuring the effectiveness of training	33	1,666 ^a	1,267	85	3,070 ^{ab}	1,502	71	2,422 ^b	1,306	30	1,900 ^b	1,469	10,828	0,000	Bonferroni
Colaborativo															
The company communicates with the employers	67	8,522 ^a	4,377	101	16,227 ^{ab}	4,519	91	12,010 ^{ab}	4,496	66	12,318 ^{ab}	4,852	39,847	0,000	Bonferroni
The employers communicates with the company	67	6,582 ^a	4,102	101	17,069 ^{ab}	6,498	91	11,538 ^{ab}	5,778	66	11,045 ^{ab}	6,360	45,232	0,000	Games-Howell
The employees are informed about the strategy, financial performance and the organization of work	67	3,044 ^a	1,451	102	8,117 ^{ab}	1,056	91	5,109 ^{abc}	1,345	66	6,348 ^{abc}	1,246	232,802	0,000	Bonferroni
HRM works with line managers	65	2,462	1,696	101	3,000	1,697	91	2,813	1,632	66	2,515	1,638	1,882	0,13	Bonferroni

Source: Elaborated from the collection of research data. **Note:** a, b, c → Categories with significant differences obtained by the multiple comparison test.

with a larger number of organizations, which could lead to two possible findings. The first one is that the sampling for convenience favored the participation of more structured companies, therefore with more advanced practices of SHRM. The second one is that there is actually a considerable number of companies in the country adopting strategic practices of HRM. The assumption of different strategic profiles of people management in the companies surveyed is confirmed by this classification. Therefore, even when not fully considered strategic, many companies may be heading in this direction.

5.3 Comparing calculative and collaborative practices among the SHRM groups of the companies researched

In this last analysis proposed, the aim was to investigate the adoption of calculative and collaborative practices among the four strategic groups outlined in the previous analysis (Croucher et al., 2010, 2006; Gooderham et al., 1999, 2008; Poutsma et al., 2006).

The first point discussed was the reliability of the joint use of the selected items, measured by the Cronbach's alpha test. The only variable that had items deleted for adequacy of reliability was Measuring the Effectiveness of Training which in the end was measured by: Compliance with Defined Objectives in the Training and Development Plan; Performance Measurement at Work Before and Immediately After Training; Performance Measurement at Work Before and a Few Months After Training; Informal *Feedback* of the Line Managers and Informal *Feedback* of the Employees.

With the definition of these variables, there was a comparison of means by an ANOVA. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 5.

For the analysis of these data, it was important to consider that, primarily, the variance analysis indicates only whether or not there is a difference between the groups considered. To identify where these differences are, it was necessary to perform a post-hoc test, and the Games-Howell and Bonferroni test was chosen for this study. The first for equal variances and the second for different variances.

The first data shown in Table 5 is the variable HR Works with Line Managers, which shows no significant difference among the groups surveyed. This suggests that this is a widespread practice among

organizations, regardless of how the people management of these companies works. A plausible explanation for this is that the personalism of the Brazilian culture can act more forcefully on this point of the organizations than the strategy adopted. All other variables showed a difference in at least one of the group comparisons.

In the analysis of the variables categorized as calculative (first four rows of Table 4) the Operational HRM group has a significant difference in all variables in this category, compared to the Strategic HRM group and for the first three variables of the Formalized HRM group. Thus, analyzing the means, it is possible to say that the Operational HRM is less calculative than these two groups, as all their means are lower. Moreover, there was no significant difference found between the Operational and Communicative HRM groups for the calculative variables.

Comparing the Strategic HRM group with the Formalized HRM group, a significant statistical difference was found in all variables. The same occurred in the Communicative HRM group, except for the variable Formal Performance Evaluation. Thus, again it appears that in all these cases the means obtained by the Strategic HRM group for the calculative variables was higher than in the other groups analyzed.

The only significant statistical difference between the Formalized and Communicative HRM took place for the variable Formal Performance Evaluation. The mean for the first group was significantly higher than for the second. This suggests that the Formalized HRM group is more calculative than the Communicative HRM group.

Thus, what is outlined is that the calculative typology emerges in organizations with a more strategic people management. The second more calculative group was the Formalized HRM and no significant difference stood out in the use of such practices between the Operational and Communicative HRM groups.

Regarding the collaborative perspective, only the first three variables for this comparative analysis were considered: The Company Communicates with Employees; The Employees Communicate with the Company; and The Employees are Informed on the Strategy, Financial Performance and Work Organization. The Operational HRM group showed a

significant difference when compared to all the others and, again, the lowest means. Thus, it can be considered the least collaborative among the groups.

The Strategic HRM group also had the highest means for the three variables considered when compared to all other groups. Thus, besides being the most calculative group, it consists of companies that also employ more collaborative practices.

The Formalized HRM group showed a difference when compared to the Communicative HRM group only for the item Employees are Informed on the Strategy, Financial Performance and Work Organization with the mean for the first one being lower than for the second one. Therefore, the Communicative HRM group shows more collaborative characteristics than the Formalized HRM group, losing only for the Strategic HRM group.

Regarding the findings of collaborative practices, the strategic group stood out again. But the second place was occupied by the Communicative HRM group, followed by the Formalized and Operational HRM groups, respectively.

Thus, it was found that the organizational strategic perspective has to do with the outlined people management practices. Then it is also important to highlight that, corroborating the division resulting from the analysis of clusters and the profile of classification of these companies, the Formalized and Communicative HRM groups approach the Strategic HRM group and each favors a group of different practices and positioning, which could be seen as a phase of transition of the areas of HRM in these groups.

The most significant of these results, however, was the fact that the strategic group was classified by adopting both more calculative as collaborative practices. Although it is possible (Gooderham et al., 1999), what is happening is the highlight of one or another set of practices by region investigated. A joint explanation for this is that the calculative practices act in an individual level and the collaborative ones in a group. Moreover, the plurality associated with the Brazilian scenario, constructed from different sources, may explain the prevalence of these two positions in strategic perspective.

From the calculative disposition it is possible to highlight the prevalence of the American literature influence on the HRM area in the country. Furthermore, the existence in the country of

multinationals based in countries in which such practices prevail may also favor its adoption and legitimation. Culturally, plasticity, i.e., appreciation of what is foreign, also brings more likelihood to take on models and concepts developed in countries with prevalence of these practices, particularly the US.

On the other hand, several features of Brazilian culture favor collaborative practices: collectivism, personalism, femininity and warmth. These aspects support actions that consider the employees' views, communication and partnership with employees (Croucher et al., 2006). Furthermore, labor relations are governed by legislation that guarantees various rights to workers and their protection. Legal systems adopted in Brazil restrict the possibility of calculative practices of HRM (Brookes et al., 2011).

The interpretation of these findings requires remembering that the choice of one or another set of practices is not an HRM autonomous decision by the companies surveyed, but is aligned with the organization and are influenced mainly by the local context with the existing institutional particularities (Croucher et al., 2006). In this sense, research doing this contextualization may bring promising results on the motivating factors of adopting different people management models in Brazil.

6. Final thoughts

The HRM can create organizational conditions that leverage competitiveness, but it depends on your choices and proper positioning. Therefore it requires knowledge of the area and understanding the context in which it is inserted (Martín-Alcázar et al., 2005). The contextual field includes, in addition to the organization itself, the local and global scenarios, which can have a potential influence on the choice of the people management practices by managers.

All of these scenarios have undergone changes in recent decades, and pressed the HRM to change the way companies manage their employees. The literature investigating this area in Brazil reports a movement that moves the operating position to a strategic trend (Coltro, 2009; Fischer, 2002; Lacombe & Tonelli, 2001; Piellusch & Taschner, 2009; S. Silva & Azzuz, 2003; Tinoco, 2005).

This finding reinforces the importance of understanding the spread of the practices adopted by HRM in companies operating in Brazil. Overall, the data presented in this study on HRM in Brazil

corroborate the literature (Tanure, Evans, & Cançado, 2010b; Tanure, Evans, & Pucik, 2007; I. Vasconcelos, Mascarenhas, & Vasconcelos, 2004) which suggests that the area, in the country, **is experiencing a period of transformation, leading to a strategic perspective**. There is a higher concentration of companies in the Strategic HRM group, followed by the Formalized and Communicative HRM, which show some practices also characteristically strategic.

This classification allowed to relate these groups to the calculative and collaborative models (Croucher et al., 2010, 2006; Gooderham et al., 1999, 2008; Poutsma et al., 2006). The **companies classified in the Strategic HRM group have more calculative and collaborative practices than the other companies**. On the other hand, the companies classified as Operational HRM show lower means for all the practices and in relation to all the groups that have significant differences. The Formalized and Communicative HRM groups, with means significantly different from the other groups (Operational and Strategic), show intermediate values. Among themselves, they obtained a difference only in one of the items in each set of practices. Therefore, the companies of the Formalized HRM group could be classified as more calculative and those belonging to the Communicative HRM group as more collaborative. Although none has reached means higher than the ones for the Strategic HRM.

Understanding these findings requires a discussion of the institutional and cultural factors that affect both the choices made by organizations as the implemented HRM practices (Brewster, 2004; Brewster, 2006; Budhwar & Debrah, 2001; Budhwar & Sparrow, 2002; Gooderham & Nordhaug, 2010; Morley & Collings, 2004; Müller-Camen, 1999; Tanure et al., 2007). Certain conditions may favor calculative actions, while other reasons can stimulate collaborative practices.

As shown above, the acceptance and incorporation of the American literature in Brazil tends to favor the choice of calculative practices because the US culture is seen as individualistic and manly (competitive) (G. Hofstede, G. J. Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; Hofstede, 2001). Another important point is the coexistence of organizations of different origins in the same context. The sample consisted of 25% of organizations originating in other countries. The presence of organizations of American origin can

strengthen the adoption of calculative practices. On the other hand, subsidiaries based in Europe tend to favor collaborative practices since Brewster (2007b) classifies the HRM in this area as more collectivist, with state control over labor relations and a more critical literature.

In the national perspective, Brazilian culture is seen as collectivist (Barbosa, 2003; Hofstede, et al., 2010; Hofstede, 2001), i.e., there is special focus on relationships, group harmony and control of confrontation as well as achieving the goals set for the group. In addition, the country is marked by great inequality, and therefore “compensatorily developing a broad social protection system” (Bresser-Pereira, 2011, p.10).

These variables show a very heterogeneous picture as the antagonistic variables push the organizations located in the country in different directions. This makes understandable the adoption of various HRM practices by the groups outlined. Companies classified as Strategic HRM appear to be the only ones which can work with these different positions, making use of both calculative and collaborative actions. This confirms the literature that presents these different approaches not as mutually exclusive, but as orthogonal (Gooderham et al., 1999) or complementary (Rousseau & Arthur, 1999).

These findings also support the research by Lemos, Santos and Dubeux (2013, p. 81), in which they investigate “the expectations of Brazilian and North American workers about the organizations’ human resources guidelines.” In the empirical research, the value of practices focused in the group was identified, regardless of the respondent’s nationality, and a slightly greater acceptance by Brazilians for the use of practices linked to individual aspects. These data reinforce the importance of organizations to develop actions capable of reconciling practices of different lines, both calculative and collaborative.

Further analyses resulting from this research confirm that the practices of the group classified as Operational were the least calculative and collaborative, suggesting that these companies are below others in dealing with the forces that are pushing both for efficiency and for the relationship with employees. In the same way, it can be said that the Formalized and Communicative HRM groups stood out, respectively, in calculative and collaborative practices, although to a lesser degree

than the Strategic HRM. Therefore, the data suggest that the companies of these groups are better prepared to deal with the institutional and cultural forces that act on people management than the companies classified as Operational and that seem to have different propensities to deal with such factors.

Based on these findings, it is possible to say that the evolution of the area to a more strategic perspective suggests the capacity of organizations to meet current demands, as it is known that the people management area has an influence on the organizational success, although it is not the only condition for this. For its development to continue to advance, it is important that aspects revealed as more inchoate gain new contours, such as the development and implementation of practices that relate performance and rewards and more effective measures of the results provided by the training applied by the companies.

Another highlight is the use of conciliatory people management practices oriented for performance (calculative) regarding collaboration. The Brazilian historical and cultural miscegenation allows the use of a set of practices that have the same origins. Unlike European organizations, in which collaborative practices are predominant, and those originating in the Anglo-Saxon countries, where the Calculative HRM is predominant, companies in Brazil adopt both.

6.1 Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research

Inevitably, any research, as it involves choices, undergoes limitations. In this study it is important to note that, unlike other research in the area, this one did not work with the employees' perception of HRM, an aspect that can be positive because it reduces the bias in obtaining results. On the other hand, it brings a "cold" view of what happens in organizations, as it analyzes the existence of certain practices, not allowing a thorough analysis of how these practices are effectively carried out.

It is also necessary to point out that although the sample has been significant, it is not possible to generalize the data reported for Brazil as a whole, as it is not representative of this scenario. To minimize this problem, it is suggested that future research expand the sample size and the sampling method used.

Among suggestions for future research, researching the set of the so-called collective HRM practices is recommended (Poutsma et al., 2013; Rizov & Croucher, 2009), which places employees as organizational knowledge holders to produce more effective results. Another possibility, also considering this aspect, is to investigate whether the calculative and collaborative practices are expressed in the same way for all organizational layers. Exploring this design in depth can bring reconciliation to the idea of a joint existence of these people management actions, which, although not incompatible, have grown from distinct roots.

Comparing the data found in this study with those presented by other countries is recommended.

7. References

- Antonenko, P. D., Toy, S., & Niederhauser, D. S. (2012). Using cluster analysis for data mining in educational technology research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 60, 383–398. doi: 10.1007/s11423-012-9235-8
- Apospori, E., Nikandrou, I., Brewster, C., & Papalexandris, N. (2008). HRM and organizational performance in northern and southern Europe. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(7), 1187–1207.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *Métodos de Pesquisa de Survey*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.
- Barbosa, L. (2003). *Igualdade e meritocracia: a ética do desempenho nas sociedades modernas* (4 ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV.
- Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A., & Ulrich, D. (2001). *Gestão estratégica de pessoas com scorecard: interligando pessoas, estratégias e performance*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus.
- Biron, M., Farndale, E., & Paauwe, J. (2011). Performance management effectiveness: lessons from world-leading firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(06), 1294–1311. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.559100
- Boselie, P., Dietz, G., & Boon, C. (2005). Commonalities and contradictions in research on Human Resource Management and performance. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 15(3), 67–94. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2005.tb00154.x
- Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2011). *Strategic and Human Resource Management* (3rd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2011). Cinco modelos de capitalismo. *Texto Para Discussão EESP/FGV*, (280), 1–17.
- Brewster, C. (2004). European perspectives on Human Resource Management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 14, 365 – 382.
- Brewster, C. (2006). Comparing HRM policies and practices across geographical borders. In G. K. Stahl & I. Björkman (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in International Human Resource Management* (1st. ed.). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Brewster, C. (2007a). A European perspective on HRM, *European J. International Management*, 1(3), 239–259.
- Brewster, C. (2007b). Comparative HRM: European views and perspectives. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(5), 769–787. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.1024
- Brookes, M., Croucher, R., Fenton-O’Creevy, M., & Gooderham, P. (2011). Measuring competing explanations of Human Resource Management practices through the Cranet survey: cultural versus institutional explanations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 68–79. doi:10.1016/j.hrmmr.2010.09.012
- Bruzzo, F., & Basso, J. (2012). *Article review - measuring competing explanations of human resources management practices through the Cranet survey: cultural versus institutional explanations*. Venezia.
- Budhwar, P. S., & Debrah, Y. (2001). Rethinking comparative and cross-national human resource management research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(3), 497–515. Doi: 10.1080/713769629
- Budhwar, P. S., & Sparrow, P. R. (2002). An integrative framework for understanding cross-national Human Resource Management practices. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 377 – 403.
- Chu, R. A., & Wood Jr., T. (2008). Cultura organizacional brasileira pós-globalização: global ou local? *Revista de Administração Pública*, 42(5), 969–991.
- Coltro, A. (2009). Seção de pessoal, departamento de pessoal, administração de pessoal, administração de relações industriais, administração de Recursos Humanos, Gestão de Recursos Humanos, Gestão de Pessoas, ... ou o multiforme esforço do constante jogo. *Revista de Administração Da UNIMEP*, 7(1), 41–60.
- Cranet. (2011). *Cranet survey on comparative Human Resource Management: international executive report 2011*.
- Croucher, R., Brookes, M., Wood, G., & Brewster, C. (2010). Context, strategy and financial participation: a comparative analysis. *Human Relations*, 63(6), 835–855. doi: 10.1177/0018726709343654
- Croucher, R., Gooderham, P., & Parry, E. (2006). The influences on direct communication in British and Danish firms: country, “Strategic HRM” or unionization? *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 12(3), 267–286. doi: 10.1177/0959680106068913
- Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in Strategic Human Resource Management: tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 802–835. doi: 10.2307/256713
- Demo, G., Fogaça, N., Nunes, I., Edrei, L., & Francischeto, L. (2011). Políticas de Gestão de Pessoas no novo milênio: cenário dos estudos publicados nos períodos da área de administração entre 2000 e 2010. *RAM. Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 12(5), 15–42.
- Fávero, L. P., Belfiore, P., Silva, F. L. da, & Chan, B. L. (2009). *Análise de dados: modelagem multivariada para tomada de decisões* (1a. ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Editora Campus.
- Fischer, A. L. (2002). Um resgate conceitual e histórico dos modelos de gestão de pessoas. In *As pessoas na organização* (15th ed., pp. 11–34). São Paulo: Editora Gente.
- Gooderham, P., & Nordhaug, O. (2010). One European model of HRM? Cranet empirical contributions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(1), 27–36. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmmr.2010.09.009
- Gooderham, P., Nordhaug, O., & Ringdal, K. (1999). Institutional and rational determinants of organizational practices: Human Resource Management in European firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 507–531.
- Gooderham, P., Parry, E., & Ringdal, K. (2008). The impact of bundles of strategic human resource management practices on the performance of European firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(11), 2041–2056.
- Guest, D. (1989). Personnel and HRM: can you tell the difference? *Personnel Management Journal*,

- 48–51.
- Gurkov, I., Zelenova, O., & Saidov, Z. (2012). Mutation of HRM practices in Russia: an application of CRANET methodology. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(7), 1289–1302. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2011.581633
 - Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (2001). *Varieties of capitalism: the institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2 nd.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Ltd.
 - Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures e organizational: software of the mind* (3 rd.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
 - Kramar, R. (2012). Trends in Australian Human Resource Management: what next? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 50(2), 133–150. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7941.2011.00009.x
 - Kramar, R., & Parry, E. (2014). Strategic Human Resource management in the Asia Pacific region: similarities and differences? *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 52(March), 400–419.
 - Lacombe, B. M. B., & Tonelli, M. J. (2001). O discurso e a prática: o que nos dizem os especialistas e o que nos mostram as práticas das empresas sobre os modelos de Gestão de Recursos Humanos. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 5(2), 157–174.
 - Larsen, H. H., & Brewster, C. (2003). Line management responsibility for HRM: what is happening in Europe? *Employee Relations*, 25(3), 228–244. doi: 10.1108/01425450310475838
 - Lazarova, M., Morley, M., & Tyson, S. (2008). International comparative studies in HRM and performance – the Cranet data. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(11), 1995–2003. doi: 10.1080/09585190802404239
 - Lemos, A. H. da C., Santos, D. M., & Dubeux, V. J. C. (2013). Práticas de gestão de pessoas individualistas ou coletivistas : o que brasileiros e norteamericanos demandam? *Revista ADM.MADE*, 17(1), 80–100.
 - Lepak, D. P., & Shaw, J. D. (2008). Strategic HRM in North America: looking to the future. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(8), 1486–1499. doi: 10.1080/09585190802200272
 - Malhotra, N. K. (2006). *Pesquisa de marketing: uma orientação aplicada* (4th ed.). Porto Alegre: Bookman.
 - Martín-Alcázar, F., Romero-Fernández, P. M., & Sánchez-Gardey, G. (2005). Strategic Human Resource Management: integrating the universalistic, contingent, configurational and contextual perspectives. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(5), 633–659. doi: 10.1080/09585190500082519
 - Mayrhofer, W., Brewster, C., Morley, M. J., & Ledolter, J. (2011). Hearing a different drummer? Convergence of Human Resource Management in Europe — a longitudinal analysis. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 50–67. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.011
 - Ministério do Trabalho e do Emprego. (2014). *CAGED anuário RAIS*. Brasília. Retrieved from http://bi.mte.gov.br/bgcaged/caged_anuario_rais/caged_anuario_raistela90.php
 - Morley, M. J., & Collings, D. G. (2004). Contemporary debates and new directions in HRM in MNCs: introduction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 25(6), 487–499. doi: 10.1108/01437720410560406
 - Müller-Camen, M. (1999). Unitarism, pluralism, and Human Resource Management in Germany. *Management International Review*, 39(3), 125–144.
 - Paauwe, J., & Boselie, P. (2005). HRM and performance: what' s Next? In *CAHRS - Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies*. Ithaca - NY: Cornell University ILR School.
 - Parry, E., Dickmann, M., & Morley, M. (2008). North American MNCs and their HR policies in liberal and co-ordinated market economies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(11), 2024–2040. doi: 10.1080/09585190802404262
 - Peng, M. W. (2005). Perspectives-from China strategy to global strategy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22(2), 123–141. doi: 10.1007/s10490-005-1251-3
 - Piellusch, M., & Taschner, G. B. (2009). Indicadores de RH no setor hoteleiro: um estudo nas maiores redes no Brasil. *Organização & Sociedade*, 15(51), 665–686.
 - Poutsma, E., Ligthart, P. E. M., & Dietz, B. (2013). HRM policies and firm performance: the role of synergy of policies. In E. Parry, E. Stavrou, & M. Lazarova (Eds.), *Global Trends in Human Resource Management* (1st ed., pp. 78–102). London:

Palgrave Macmillan.

- Poutsma, E., Ligthart, P. E. M., & Veersma, U. (2006). The diffusion of calculative and collaborative HRM practices in European firms. *Industrial Relations*, 45(4), 513–546. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-232X.2006.00442.x
- Rizov, M., & Croucher, R. (2009). Human Resource Management and performance in European firms. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 33(1), 253–272. doi: 10.1093/cje/ben037
- Rousseau, D. M., & Arthur, M. B. (1999). The boundaryless Human Resource function: building agency and community in the new economic era. *Organizational Dynamics*, 27(4), 7–18.
- Schuler, R. S. (1992). Strategic Human Resources Management: linking the people with the strategic needs of the business. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21(1), 18–32.
- Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (2005). A quarter-century review of Human Resource Management in the US: the growth in importance of the international perspective. *Management Review*, 16(1), 11–35.
- Silva, S. R., & Azzuz, E. (2003). Gestão de Pessoas na indústria de calçados de Franca: departamento burocrático ou parceiro estratégico? *Revista Eletrônica de Administração - FACEF*, 2(3), 1–20.
- Stavrou, E., & Kilaniotis, C. (2010). Flexible work and turnover: an empirical investigation across cultures. *British Journal of Management*, 21(2), 541–554. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00659.x
- Subramony, M. (2006). Why Organizations Adopt some Human Resource Management Practices and Reject Others: An Exploration of Rationales. *Human Resource Management*, 45(2), 195–210. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20104
- Supangco, V. T. (2012). Strategic HR practices in some organizations in the Philippines. *Philippine Management Review*, 19, 35–48.
- Tanure, B., Evans, P., & Caçado, V. L. (2010a). As Quatro Faces de RH : Analisando a Performance da Gestão de Recursos Humanos em Empresas no Brasil. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea - RAC*, 14(2), 594–614.
- Tanure, B., Evans, P., & Caçado, V. L. (2010b). As Quatro Faces de RH : Analisando a Performance da Gestão de Recursos Humanos em Empresas no Brasil. *Human Resource Management*, 14(2), 594–614.
- Tanure, B., Evans, P., & Pucik, V. (2007). *A Gestão de Pessoas no Brasil: virtudes e pecados capitais* (1st. ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier.
- Tinoco, J. E. P. (2005). Gestão estratégica do capital humano. *Organizações em Contexto*, 1(1), 13–70.
- Tonelli, M. J., Caldas, M., Lacombe, B. M. B., & Tinoco, T. (2003). Produção acadêmica em Recursos Humanos no Brasil: 1991-2000. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 43(1), 1–18.
- Uysal, G. (2014). Convergence or divergence between European HRM. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 5(10), 1923–1928. doi: 10.17265/2328-7144/2016.02.004
- Vasconcelos, I., Mascarenhas, A. O., & Vasconcelos, F. (2004). Paradoxos organizacionais, Gestão de Pessoas e tecnologia na Souza Cruz. *RAE Eletrônica*, 3(2), 1–20.
- Whitley, R. (1999). *Divergent capitalisms: the social structuring and change of business systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ABOUT AUTHORS

- **Tatiani dos Santos Zuppani** is PhD in Management from Universidade de São Paulo. Researcher in the area of Management of Human Resources and Career. E-mail: tszuppani@gmail.com
- **André Luiz Fischer** is Professor in the Management Department at FEA USP, teaching classes and directing research papers, master's doctoral and postdoctoral. He coordinates specialized courses in Human Resources Management acting as a consultant and researcher at FIA administration and business college. E-mail: afisher@usp.br

Gestão internacional comparativa de recurso humanos e gestão de recursos humanos no Brasil: Uma análise frente aos modelos calculativos e colaborativos

Tatiani dos Santos Zuppani e André Luiz Fischer

Universidade de São Paulo - USP, São Paulo, SP, Brasil.

DETALHES DO ARTIGO

Histórico do artigo:

Recebido em 11 de janeiro de 2016

Aceito em 28 de abril de 2016

Disponível online em 31 de agosto de 2016

Sistema de Revisão "Double Blind Review"

Editor científico:

Eduardo Eugênio Spers

Palavras-chaves:

Gestão Internacional Comparativa de Recursos Humanos;

Gestão Estratégica de Recursos Humanos;

Modelo Calculativo;

Modelo Colaborativo.

RESUMO

O objetivo deste estudo foi analisar a adoção de práticas calculativas e colaborativas, dominantes na gestão internacional comparativa de recursos humanos, segundo os diferentes perfis das áreas de Gestão de Recursos Humanos (GRH) de organizações privadas atuantes no Brasil. O método empregado foi um Survey, operacionalizado por meio de um questionário eletrônico sobre práticas de GRH e características organizacionais. Foram obtidos um total de 326 respondentes. Inicialmente foi realizado um cluster no qual os respondentes foram agrupados em quatro grupos com perfis de GRH distintos. A utilização de práticas calculativas e colaborativas foi comparada nos quatro grupos formados através de um teste Anova. Os principais achados mostraram que o grupo estratégico foi aquele com maior média de adoção de práticas calculativas e colaborativas. O grupo GRH Comunicativa apresentava uma propensão maior para práticas colaborativas e o grupo GRH Formalizada adotava práticas calculativas, embora nenhum dos grupos apresentou uma média de adoção do que o grupo GRH Estratégico. Isto sugere que é preciso aprender a lidar com aspectos diferentes que envolvem a gestão de pessoas nas organizações que atuam no Brasil.

© 2016 Internext | ESPM. Todos os direitos reservados!

To cite this article:

Zuppani, T. S. & Fischer, A. L. (2016) *Comparative international management of human resources and human resources management in Brazil: An analysis in view of the calculative and collaborative models. Internext – Revista Eletrônica de Negócios Internacionais. 11 (2), p.49-65.*

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18568/1980-4865.11249-65>