Indigenous Brazilian Management Practices

Zandra Balbinot¹, Luciano Minghini², Rafael Borim-de-Souza³

Abstract

Purpose: The present research seeks to understand to what extent companies in emerging countries, specifically, Brazilian, adopt dominant management practices, the so-called Euro-American practices, possess their one, or show a syncretism between the two. Methods: Mixed research. One phase was to collect data using a survey about cultural dimensions adopted from GLOBE (House 1998) management practices and also from Brazilian academy. Another was to collect data through interviews, which were analyzed in parallel. Results: Of the seven dominant cultural dimensions, indigenous practices influenced two. Another three were influenced by dominant management practices. Two of the local dimensions, even with internationalization, merged practices with Brazilian cultural traits. Even so, the practices derived from Jeitinho diminished relative to the international relations and experience of managers. Conclusions: The paper shows the existence of powerful Brazilian Indigenous Managerial Practices such as personalism and formalism. These practices have great influence on international business negotiations. On the other hand, it also shows that there are still dominant managerial practices specially in the case of more internationalized Brazilian managers.
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Introduction

Since the 1960’s, the debate about the appropriateness of management principles from the United States and other countries has become an important focus of research. The American management model is still the reference, however, with the constant evolution of the global economy, the development of communications and international relations, is appropriateness is increasingly contested. In the same way, other models, such as from Germany and Japan, have been adopted by other countries. Globalization has brought mixed characteristics to how companies are managed, whereupon the dominant models are adapted to necessities, especially to local cultures. Various authors have observed that local management situations truly have unique realities that are different from those in dominant countries and which can become a source of competitive advantage. In international business, the diversity of management practices appears most prominently in local markets, at the industry level and among the people that establish them. In this sense, this research seeks to understand to what extent companies in emerging countries adopt dominant management practices, indigenous practices, or a syncretism between the two. Comparisons between managerial practices can be made between countries or based upon cultural roots which serve as a reference in the comparison between different groups or practices (Liesch and Knight, 1999; Oviatt and McDougall, 2005; Schollhammer, 1975).

The importance of this study comes from the need for understanding and accepting the existence of different local management practices which are affected by internationalization (Buckley and Casson, 1998; Dawson, 2001; Melin, 1992).

We first present a brief history and review of comparative management research in order to display a synthesis of the debate concerning cultural characteristics and origins of management practices. This is used to support the subsequent study of indigenous practices used by Brazilian managers in internationally active organizations located in southern Brazil. Data was gathered through a web survey and eight interviews using cultural dimensions of managerial practices adopted from GLOBE and Brazilian academy, allowing for an analysis of managers’ perceptions about the daily use of indigenous practices, the adoption of dominant practices, and Euro-American influences.

Comparative Management Perspective

Contemporary knowledge in comparative management theory, as well as its epistemological and methodological foundations, is rooted in colonialist practices that were primarily extended throughout the world from European pow-

er (Smith, 1999; Westwood, 2004). Just as the relationships between colonies and metropoles developed over time with the concession of new international representativeness for existing countries, there is currently a need to analyze the relationships between these countries using different variables, among them management practices, using a post-colonialist interpretive perspective (Overing, 2006; Pfeffer, 2005).

European manipulation, as manifested in the socio-cultural context, has left remnants that are still experienced by former colonies, such as devastated ecosystems, dissemination of widespread poverty, and the domination of utilitarian and teleological discourse of how to best understand reality. The suppressed areas, in other words, did not try to be understood by the metropoles, but instead tried to be alike in a subordinate and inferior relationship (Parry, 1987; Peterson, 2001).

By observing the contemporary geopolitical context which is based upon institutionalized knowledge systems, it is possible to declare that research into comparative management theory can be organized as a new benchmark, which does not mention merely Europe and comes to consider the Euro-American project as it relates to the world. The project is intended to understand, predict and control economic, technological and productive development systems (Katz, 2001; Tsui, 2007; Westwood, 2001).

In a concise manner, the studies connected to comparative management theory are conducted for and by the Euro-American center and seeks to ensure that the management and business practices of the others (in this case no longer colonies, but the countries that relate to this center) are accessible and understandable so that strategic commercial relationships can be constructed. The imposed strategy of international relations is self-perpetuating, in which this Euro-American center seeks to control the transformations that are occurring in the emerging economies, primarily those related to the alteration of social structures, values and behavioral patterns of a given society (Hoogvelt, 2001; Raghuram and Madge, 2006; Westwood, 2001).

This scenario of comparison with the Euro-American center allows a recurring misconception in academy, which treats international management as synonymous with comparative management (Redding, 1994). Schollhammer (1975) established an objective differentiation: research into international management is interested in understanding the management and operations of multinational enterprises, while comparative management is focused on the institutional and cultural similarities and differences that relate to managerial practices in different countries.

This differentiation, when combined with Westwood’s (2001,
In fact, the primary objective of comparative management theory is to develop a body of knowledge that endows the ability to forecast and explain the efficiency and success of companies in different countries (Alton, 1969). Those who study comparative management theory focus on the external environment, because it contributes specific elements that contribute in special ways to the managerial efficiency of an organization (Clifford and Marcus, 1986).

In this sense, comparative management theory is interdisciplinary, in that academics who study related subjects also conduct parallel studies about other topics which help aggregate a greater depth to the findings of comparative management (Jack and Westwood, 2009; Schollhammer, 1975).

The interdisciplinary aspect of this theoretical body can be seen in its methodological potential. Schollhammer (1969, 1973) suggests a typology where studies in comparative management fall into two categories: (1) the abstract-theoretical, which seeks to ground comparative management theory through the construction of theoretical models, conceptual structures and specific typologies for developing and testing hypotheses; (2) the empirical, which understands the research forces which seek to explain, evaluate and accumulate the data collected by empirical research. This typology shows that comparative management theory, while located within the field of management studies, does not possess a theoretical body which can be analyzed merely through a single knowledge perspective.

There are three conceptual approaches for comparative management: socioeconomic, aimed at economic development; ecological, focused on the external environment; and behavioral (Neghandi, 1975).

The socioeconomic approach, focused on economic development, starts its analysis from the fact that management symbolizes the most critical and relevant characteristic for economic development of any given region. Management is considered one of the primary conduits for change, but it is only one of the many parts that compose a socioeconomic system (Neghandi, 1975; Schollhammer, 1969).

The ecological approach, focused on the environment, seeks to isolate the variables in the external environment based upon similarities and differences that are attributed to the different managerial activities in various national contexts. The business focus of a firm is seen as an ecological system, in that external factors have a determining impact on managerial efficiency, which in turn influence firm performance. This system influences the overall economic efficiency. Ecological components are seen as potential impediments for effective managerial practice (Neghandi; Schollhammer, 1969).

Researchers that use the behavioral approach to conduct analysis of comparative management prioritize specific manager behaviors that exercise their functions in different cultural contexts. It is important that motivations for finding particular results related to specific managerial attitudes and their respective professional relationships are taken into account. These are important for understanding the interactions between individuals and society in a way that organizational objectives can be adequately achieved (Neghandi; Schollhammer, 1969). By considering the cultural roots and relationships in comparative analysis of managerial practices, we believe that the behavioral approach is the closest for studying indigenous practices of specific groups as contrasted against what are considered global (House, Javidan, 2002); convergent (Butt, Jaeger, 2010; Jaeger, Avrichir, 2010; Webber, 1969); or dominant practices (Neghandi, 1975; Schollhammer, 1975).

Even though Schollhammer (1969, 1973, 1975) defends the comparative management theory as a pluralistic theoretical body, its different characteristics don’t remove the overwhelming content of domination in comparative studies. It is possible to affirm that the areas which are not located in the West, specifically in the Euro-American center, were systematically subjected to Western scientific and technological knowledge in a way that the others always taken out of their realities and reconstructed by a dominant comparative discourse (Said, 1978). This was the context by which all of the management practices were developed: from the management of the colonies up to the global international management found today. Western science, for its part, was intrinsically involved in the practice, in that it was used to justify the negation of the other in favor of the proliferation of the practices, ways of living and knowledge of the dominant discourses (Westwood, 2004).

Under a methodological analysis we can see theories that were predominantly developed through deductive approaches, testing of hypotheses and statistical analysis. Such considerations reassert that the comparative management theory emerged in a discursive space in which structural functionalism represented the dominant paradigm and sustained the rationality for the construction of explanations that could be generalized and applied as universal rules. Functionalist leanings gained more strength in inspecting how different
economies began to industrialize and develop, resulting in a teleological historiography dictating a common trajectory that should be followed by countries so that economic success could be reached (Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991). As a response to this, some researchers began to develop their studies along more orthodox lines, which, even though they claimed to promote different methodologies, were still rooted in functionalist traditions. This is a fact which still persists in the presumption of uniqueness, specialty, and truth in Euro-American science as compared to the rest of the world (Parry, 1987). There is still a prevalence of reverence for and dissemination of management practices developed by the Euro-American center over those from the rest of the world.

But after all, are the Euro-American managerial practices still generalizable and unique?

**Managerial Practices’ Cultural Roots**

Managerial practices are carried out by one or more organizations which begin and develop through the interactions between the people involved. These interactions emerge with time and according to organizational needs, such as the need to internationalize, allowing for the emergence of an interdependent union of activities coherently oriented towards a specific strategy (Newman and Nollen, 1996; Jarzabkowski, 2005; Whittington, 1996).

The content of strategic management practices is confirmed by the fact that they are influenced by and dependent upon cultural values which are expressed in the values built through relationships with the external business environment (Inglehart and Baker, 2000; Johnson et al., 2007; Ralston, Gustafson, 1993). Thus, the managerial practices can be defined as a union of organizational activities that are carved out depending upon cultural demands (Jarzabkowski, 2010).

In this sense, values can be understood as managerial practices’ cultural roots (Hofstede, 1991; Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz, 1994). Values are part of the cultural formation of a group, and thus they conform to the context in which the group is inserted (Hofstede, 1991; Torres Jr., Gati, 2011). The social reality experienced by this group of people displays the preference these individuals have about important aspects that organizations must understand if they desire to accomplish business in different country locations. Jaeger, Avrichir (2010) analyzed Hofstede’s (1991) contributions, determining that the values represent non-specific, shared beliefs and feelings, which together influence the processes governing the social choices and decisions taken by individuals.

Based upon the propositions found in Hofstede (1991) and Schwartz (1994; 1994), a group of researchers coordinated by House (1998) developed a project called GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness) identified groups of countries with similar cultural characteristics and individual values. In order to measure cultural differences, GLOBE opted to directly observe the similarities in practices within families, companies and political institutions (House, 1998).

This allowed for the values both influencing and influenced by the behaviors, policies and practices to be studied in light of the managerial practices in organizations (House, Javidan, 2001). Thus, the GLOBE proposal came to help in the study of the managerial practices labeled dominant, or dominant, by the comparative management academy. In what is referred to as the Brazilian context of studies about cultural values and characteristics (Barbosa, 1992; Da Matta, 1997; Freyre, 1984; Motta, 1997; Ramos, 1989; Salami, Soltanzadeh, 2012) eight local values dimensions were identified as influencing Brazilian managerial practices listed in Table 1 as follows (Chu and Wood, 2008; Machado-da-Silva and Oliveira, 2001).

In this sense, this research seeks to understand to what extent companies in emerging countries adopt dominant management practices, indigenous practices, or a syncretism between the two. For that, the methodological process is explained in the next section.

**Methodological Process**

In order to verify if indigenous managerial practices remain present in the routines of managers’ who are internationally active, or if they are being replaced by dominant managerial practices (that originate in Euro-American cultural characteristics), we undertook an investigation guided by the behavioral approach suggested by Schollhammer (1969). This approach allows analyses of comparative management by prioritizing behavior within a specific cultural context, in this case Brazilian. GLOBE (House, 1998) dimensions were used for measuring the managerial practices, together with the Brazilian cultural characteristics identified by Machado-da-Silva and Oliveira (2001), Machado-da-Silva and Shimomish (2003), and Chu and Wood (2008). These latter define the indigenous managerial practices we hoped to analyze.

The study began by reviewing the theoretical underpinnings and previous empirical results, and then proceeded to collect initial data via a web-based survey. This survey was aimed at uncovering managers’ perceptions about the presence of indigenous or dominant practices in companies at different stages of internationalization. Due to a limited number of responses, the research was enhanced through individual interviews, resulting in a multi-method study (Creswell, 2007).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Short Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inequality of Power and Hierarchy | - Hierarchical relationships of colonial Brazil  
- People in superior positions believe that they possess special rights that exempt them from common laws.  
- Similar to the Power Distance dimension ideas.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Jeitinho (i.e. a way)            | - Smart, creative, flexible or even, unofficial ways of accomplishing difficult tasks, most often outside of official procedures, channels, and especially through the use of favors and relationships.  
- Seeks to balance the daily needs of individuals with the demands and restrictions imparted by laws and rules.  
- Actions, decisions, behavior and/or creative angles adopted in social interactions that aim to accomplish objectives in spite of opposing legal circumstances.                                                                 |
| Personalism                     | - Emphasizes relationships and acquaintances.  
- Importance attributed to individuals and personal interests to the detriment of group or community interests.  
- High degree of trust placed on family and friend networks when solving problems or obtaining privileges.  
- Sometimes it leads to favoritism, nepotism, and paternalism in relationships.                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Formalism                       | - A high degree of discrepancy between formal rules and norms and what really happens.  
- How effectively rules and norms condition behavior.  
- Seek to reduce risk and increase the level of control over human actions and behaviors.  
- Large number of rules, norms and procedures created.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Protectionism                   | - Generated from affective and intense interpersonal relationships with traces of paternalism and authoritarianism.  
- Surface from an individual external locus of control.  
- Derived from power distance and hierarchical relationships.                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Uncertainty Avoidance           | - Term coined by Hofstede.  
- Historical desire for avoiding social and interpersonal conflicts.  
- Gives rise to Personal relationships, Protectionism, and Power Distance.  
- Brazilians constantly seek peace and order in order to avoid conflict in these relationships.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Short-term Orientation           | - Consequence of the strategy adopted by the first Portuguese managers in Brazil.  
- Origin in exploitation interests and priorities  
- Defined as being based in Hofstede's Short-term/Long-term Orientation.                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Flexibility                     | - Capacity for people to be adaptive and creative in adjusting to adverse situations and innovative under challenging circumstances.  
- Stimulated by economic and market history  
- This characteristic shows Brazilians' interest in achieving results and objectives as being similar to the Hofstede's Masculinity concept.                                                                                                                                 |
| Receptiveness to what is Foreign | - Emanate from the desire for miscegenation.  
- Acceptance of racial and social mixtures.  
- Easy assimilation of foreign practices and customs, hospitality for and, admiration, valorization and imitation of what is foreign.                                                                                                                                                                                      |

Table 1: Brazilian Cultural Characteristics
The data collected through the two methods were combined during the analysis, using the perspective of comparative management theory. The level of analysis adopted was the individual and the unit of analysis was managerial practice as influenced by cultural traits. The individuals were limited to company managers, being strategic agents responsible for making decisions. These were divided into middle managers (MDM: 56.6%) and top management team (TMT: 44.4%) (Jarzabkowski, 2004).

Based upon the models, primarily GLOBE, which had been used in previous research in Brazil, we conducted a survey pre-test with 8 business executives. After necessary adaptations, we selected 2,100 emails of companies that were listed in the databases of the local federation of industries and the ministry of national industrial development as having imported or exported during 2008 or 2009. An invitation to participate with a link to the survey was sent by email on two occasions, separated by 30 days. After each mailing, the researchers randomly contacted 5% of the managers to confirm receipt of the email and reinforce the invitation to participate in the research. Out of all of the emails, 100 respondents began to fill out the electronic survey, of which 42 finished it. There were 36 valid survey responses which characterized our sample as non-parametric.

The survey was developed using GLOBE questions in order to measure the practices derived from the following cultural dimensions: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Assertiveness, Future Orientation, and Performance Orientation. These are cultural characteristics that originated from the Euro-American axis and from which Brazil diverged in previous studies (GLOBE, 2006; Jaeger and Avrichir, 2010, Machado-da-Silva and Oliveira, 2001). Some questions were designed based upon models from previous research by Machado-da-Silva and Oliveira (2001), specifically to measure the practices linked with Jeitinho, Personalism, and Formanismo. These characteristics are considered as typically Brazilian and did not raise any concerns about interpretation during the pre-test (Hilal, 2006; Hofstede and Hilal, 2010; Motta, 1997). Beyond questions about practices, there were also some formulated to measure the international relationships and participation of the managers (Karlsen and Silseth, 2003; Papadopoulos and Martin, 2010; Sullivan, 1994; Welch and Luostarinen, 1993). The questions were objective, nominal, categorical or dichotomous, and interval scales of the Likert type with intervals from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree) (Babbie, 1999; Bryman and Duncan, 2005). Table 2 displays a summary of the questions and constructs about managerial practices that were used for analysis under a comparative management perspective.

In order to collect the data for the qualitative phase, we chose the personal interview technique (Eisenhardt, 1989; Welch and Piekarki, 2011; Yin, 2011). The interviews consisted of a script constructed from the theoretical review of this research’s variables. The primary focus was on exploring everyday situations where a manager might evince practices that related to the ten measurement dimensions. The interviews were recorded, with the permission of the subjects, onto digital media. The identity of the subjects was concealed by using ENT (interview) plus a number from 1-6. Treatment of the interviews was made based upon the methodology suggested by Creswell (2007) and Merriam (2009), through content analysis without the support of specific computer programs or systems. Extracted content from the interviews was identified and classified in accord with the definitions of each category of analysis. During the qualitative phase the interview subjects asked that their names not be revealed.

Having presented the data collection and methodology, below follows a discussion about the results.

Discussion

Analysis of the data collected during the web survey and the personal interviews allowed identification of which of the dominant and indigenous cultural dimensions influenced
subjects’ managerial practices. We were also able to relate these results to the international relations and participation of the subjects.

The statistical tests began with reliability and factor analyses for the questions relating to each dimension measuring managerial practices. The first dimension analyzed was Power Distance, with a low level of reliability (alfa=0.320). The same happened with Uncertainty Avoidance (alfa=0.540), Performance Orientation (alfa=0.452), Jeitinho (alfa=0.373), Personalism (alfa=0.547) and Formalism (alfa=0.444). The results of reliability analysis for these dimensions were skewed due to the low number of responses, probably due to the stress caused by a lengthy survey.

On the other hand, we did find that some dominant practices presented statistically strong levels of reliability. The questions for the dimension Future Orientation showed an acceptable level of reliability (alfa=0.684), but did not have coefficients or sufficient KMO value (above 0.6) to allow grouping the questions into a single factor. However, the questions for the dimension Assertiveness (KMO=0.649, alfa=0.706) did provide a high level of reliability (above 0.6) and allowed for simplification into a single factor.

Even though the statistical analysis as a whole did not show sufficient levels of reliability for all dimensions, we decided to keep some specific questions that, when isolated, showed better levels of reliability and correlation with the others.

Analyzing the correlations between dominant and indigenous practices, the correlation and linear regression (stepwise model) between a manager’s level of internationalization and cultural dimensions for the practices studied, we discovered that there were interesting correlations at a mid-level (r>0.3 or r<0.3). This reinforced the data encountered in the interviews and displayed the apparent relationships.

As a part of the interviews, the subjects were asked to list, without giving order to priority, five daily activities that contribute in some way towards local or international company success; in other words, strategic management practices. Among the examples (Table 3), it was possible to identify managerial practices related to the dimensions of Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Future Orientation, Performance Orientation, and Personalism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Constructs or Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance (alfa = 0.320)</td>
<td>POD - *The people of this company who occupy positions of power try to increase their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distance from individuals with less power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance (alfa = 0.540)</td>
<td>UAV1 - *The majority of work in this organization is highly structured, leading to few unexpected events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UAV2 - *The requirements and instructions for work in this company are defined in detail, so that employees know is expected of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness (KMO = 0.649, alfa = 0.706)</td>
<td>In this company, people are normally aggressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this company, people are normally dominant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this company, people are normally rude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation (alfa = 684)</td>
<td>FOR1 - *In order to be successful in this company, it is necessary to plan ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR2 - *Everyone in this company accepts that planning for the future is the norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR3 - *The meetings in this company are normally planned well ahead of time (more than two weeks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Orientation (alfa = 0.452)</td>
<td>POR - *The majority of employees in this company set challenging goals for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeitinho (alfa = 0.373)</td>
<td>JET – I always finagle or find a new way to deal with the bureaucracy that keeps me from doing my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalism (alfa = 0.547)</td>
<td>PER – In order to advance in this company I must depend upon my personal contacts and relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalism (alfa = 0.444)</td>
<td>FOM – In this company there are rules, norms or controls that don’t relate to everyday work, are not known, or are not followed by the employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Dimensions and constructs of analyzed practices

* Inverse scales recoded during statistical treatment. ** Questions grouped as a result of factor analysis.

### Table 3: Practices considered strategic by managers.
Source: research data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterization of the practices</th>
<th>Managers' strategic practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Power Distance**  
The existence of different levels for which members of an organization or society believe and agree that power should be unequally distributed (House and Javidan, 2001). | (-) Circulate throughout the company.  
(-) Keep in contact with the manufacturing floor.  
(-) Participative management. |
| **Uncertainty Avoidance**  
Defined as the level to which members of an organization or society trust in the norms, rituals and bureaucratic practices of their society in order to minimize unpredictable future events (House and Javidan, 2001). | (+) Planning and control of purchasing and payments related to importation.  
(+) Daily monitoring of finances.  
(+) Monitoring client complaints and causes of problems. |
| **Future Orientation**  
This is the degree to which individuals in an organization or society engage in behaviors focused on future or long-term situations, where rewards are not immediate (House and Javidan, 2001)  
| (+) Weekly meetings with all company business units.  
(+) Annual meetings with headquarters.  
(+) Monthly meetings for production and sales forecasting. |
| **Performance Orientation**  
This refers to the level at which an organization or society encourages and rewards its members for excellence and improvements in performance (House and Javidan, 2001)  
| (+) Managing sales teams with motivating tactics.  
(+) Learning foreign languages.  
(+) Keeping engineering informed about market needs to improve products.  
(+) Prospecting for new clients and markets.  
(+) Technical training concerning internationalization.  
(+) Encourage team members to develop good relationships with clients. |
| **Personalism (and Networking)**  
Personalism emphasizes personal relationships and networks, expressing the importance given to people and personal interests to the detriment of group or community interests. There is a high degree of confidence in networks of family and friends when resolving problems or gaining privileges: high levels of favoritism and paternalism in relationships (Chu and Wood 2008, Machado-da-Silva and Oliveira 2001).  
| (+) Coordination of international contacts, encouraging managers to work closely with international clients.  
(+) Engaging with internal and external clients in order to understand them.  
(+) Increase or maintain networks.  
(+) Monitoring sales and contact with clients and suppliers.  
(+) Visiting trade shows and clients. |

**Indigenous Practices**

By analyzing Table 4 it is possible to see that the practices derived from the cultural characteristics Jeitinho and Personalism are not significantly related to dominant practices, and thus don’t run a risk of being replaced. For example, some authors consider Assertiveness to be the opposite of Jeitinho and Personalism (Da Matta, 1997; Vergara and Moraes, 1997). Formalism, on the other hand, has a contrasting inverse relationship with Uncertainty Avoidance ($r = -0.382$) and enhances Future Orientation ($r = -0.345$ and $-0.416$).

In Table 5 it is apparent that Jeitinho has the greatest number of average correlations ($r > 0.3$), all inversely proportional to the level of internationalization (negative $r$). Three managers interviewed explained that “out there we are just one more”, and that abroad there are formal barriers in professional relationships that are more respected than in Brazil and that can impede managers using their relationships to gain favor in controversial or complex situations (Chu and Wood, 2008). One of the directors said: “[…] I get along well with all of my contacts […] but in a different way […]”. Another stated: “[…] we play by the rules […] because it is the security that both he and I have […]”.

**Dominant Practices**

The first cultural dimension analyzed was Power Distance. Managers from countries with dominant practices show evidence of a lower idea of power distance (Hofstede, 1991). Statistically, we did not find any significant correlation with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEARMAN CORRELATION</th>
<th>International personal contacts</th>
<th>International professional contacts</th>
<th>Frequency of phone contacts</th>
<th>Frequency of e-mail contacts</th>
<th>Total of months in international courses</th>
<th>Total of months working abroad</th>
<th>Total of international activities</th>
<th>Manager International Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV1</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV2</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>-.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR1</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR2</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR3</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.409*</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.330*</td>
<td>.252*</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.410*</td>
<td>.371*</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JET</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>-.441**</td>
<td>-.345*</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>-.400*</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOM</td>
<td>Corr. Coefficient</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Correlations among cultural practice dimensions and manager internationalization level.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**Table 5: Correlations among Indigenous and Dominant cultural practice dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman Correlation</th>
<th>POD</th>
<th>UAV1</th>
<th>UAV2</th>
<th>ASS</th>
<th>FOR1</th>
<th>FOR2</th>
<th>FOR3</th>
<th>POR</th>
<th>JET</th>
<th>PER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corr. POD</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. UAV1</td>
<td>-0,105</td>
<td>0,292</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0,541</td>
<td>0,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. ASS</td>
<td>-0,278</td>
<td>0,042</td>
<td>0,352*</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0,101</td>
<td>0,809</td>
<td>0,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,541</td>
<td>0,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. FOR1</td>
<td>-0,214</td>
<td>0,325</td>
<td>0,392*</td>
<td>0,015</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0,210</td>
<td>0,053</td>
<td>0,018</td>
<td>0,931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. FOR2</td>
<td>-0,284</td>
<td>0,291</td>
<td>0,139</td>
<td>0,134</td>
<td>0,514**</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0,094</td>
<td>0,086</td>
<td>0,419</td>
<td>0,437</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,864</td>
<td>0,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. FOR3</td>
<td>0,158</td>
<td>0,274</td>
<td>-0,033</td>
<td>-0,024</td>
<td>0,080</td>
<td>0,248</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0,358</td>
<td>0,105</td>
<td>0,850</td>
<td>0,889</td>
<td>0,644</td>
<td>0,145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,864</td>
<td>0,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. POR</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>0,491**</td>
<td>0,454**</td>
<td>0,040</td>
<td>0,227</td>
<td>0,181</td>
<td>0,268</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0,002</td>
<td>0,005</td>
<td>0,819</td>
<td>0,182</td>
<td>0,291</td>
<td>0,114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0,002</td>
<td>0,005</td>
<td>0,819</td>
<td>0,182</td>
<td>0,291</td>
<td>0,114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. JET</td>
<td>-0,237</td>
<td>-0,014</td>
<td>0,191</td>
<td>0,016</td>
<td>-0,077</td>
<td>-0,011</td>
<td>-0,286</td>
<td>0,046</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0,165</td>
<td>0,937</td>
<td>0,266</td>
<td>0,925</td>
<td>0,655</td>
<td>0,949</td>
<td>0,091</td>
<td>0,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,864</td>
<td>0,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. PER</td>
<td>0,293</td>
<td>-0,041</td>
<td>-0,061</td>
<td>0,155</td>
<td>0,042</td>
<td>0,031</td>
<td>-0,157</td>
<td>0,218</td>
<td>-1,127</td>
<td>1,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0,083</td>
<td>0,813</td>
<td>0,723</td>
<td>0,367</td>
<td>0,806</td>
<td>0,856</td>
<td>0,360</td>
<td>0,201</td>
<td>0,462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,864</td>
<td>0,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr. FOM</td>
<td>0,283</td>
<td>-1,145</td>
<td>-3,382*</td>
<td>-0,271</td>
<td>-3,345*</td>
<td>-4,166*</td>
<td>0,027</td>
<td>-2,245</td>
<td>-2,228</td>
<td>2,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>0,095</td>
<td>0,398</td>
<td>0,022</td>
<td>0,110</td>
<td>0,039</td>
<td>0,012</td>
<td>0,877</td>
<td>0,150</td>
<td>0,182</td>
<td>0,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,864</td>
<td>0,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**
the indigenous dimensions (Table 5) or with a manager’s level of internationalization (Table 6). On the other side, the level of distance discovered showed a change in the comparison between our median (mean = 3.11) and that found by GLOBE (mean approximately 5.00) (Javidan and Dorfman, 2006). In addition, during the interviews, the managers cited specific practices which bring them closer to their teams and other company sectors (i.e. return to production and engineering, circulating throughout the company, participative management) as listed in Table 3. These results let us infer that the practices linked with this dimension suffer from a slight interference from international cultural characteristics.

In regards to Uncertainty Avoidance, Table 5 allow us to glean that in order to reduce uncertainty, the manager needs to keep in contact with international associates via telephone or email ($r = 0.305$ and $0.385$). As one of them explained: “[…] I need to talk to him [foreign contact] before approving my sales person’s idea […]”. Whereas in international activities such contact reduces uncertainty for the manager, in the local arena it is closeness with the team that allows for greater security. Three managers commented that they keep in contact with the manufacturing floor in order to: “[…] stay close to what is happening daily in the company, to understand the problems that are making themselves known […]”. Table 3 shows other practices managers use to maintain contact and control of information in order to reduce uncertainty. It can thus be said that the practices linked with Uncertainty Avoidance in Brazil continue to display more indigenous characteristics than global or dominant ones (Javidan and Dorfman, 2006).

Furthermore, in Table 5, the more contact ($r = 0.409$) and foreign experience (studying $r = 0.330$; or working $r = 0.352$) a manager has, the greater the change in indigenous practices focused on the short term (Machado-da-Silva and Oliveira, 2001) towards practices influenced by Future Orientation. The positive correlation shown in Table 6 (beta = 0.421) for international experience demonstrates managers’ preferences for dominant practices. Based upon the interviews with the managers that did not participate constantly in the international market, it is possible to distinguish the presence of dominant practices in planning their first importation:

“[…] I have been running after this for six months. I still haven’t done anything, practically for my importation […] it is a question of another 30-40 days from now and I should be hitting the hammer and making my first. In order to be able to in 2011 I have already started implementing my plans that I detailed already.” (Emphasis added)

International activity seems to be a new context for the managers, one where they interact and thereafter begin to redefine some practices: “[…] it is the moment from which I do this, understand?” On the other hand, in their natural habitat, the daily production, the short-term orientation continues:

“[…] the agent evaluates it quickly, because I am shortsighted. If I see that something is cool and good to use, let’s use it now, don’t wait”

Table 6: Linear regression of dominant practices, indigenous practices, and manager internationalization level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Dimension</th>
<th>Independent Dimension</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Orientation: FOR3 - The meetings in this company are normally planned well ahead of time (more than two weeks).</td>
<td>International Experience</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeitinho: JET - I always finagle or find a new way to deal with the bureaucracy that keeps me from doing my job.</td>
<td>International Experience</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>-0.445</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalism: PER - In order to advance in this company I must depend upon my personal contacts and relationships.</td>
<td>International Experience</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalism: FOM - In this company there are rules, norms or controls that don’t relate to everyday work, are not known, or are not followed by the employees.</td>
<td>International Experience</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions and Final Propositions

Based upon a quantitative and qualitative study of managers from the South of Brazil, we analyzed changes in managerial practices influenced by dominant and indigenous cultural dimensions as a consequence of the international experience and relationships managers have.

Using the GLOBE (House and Javidan, 2001) proposal and Brazilian cultural characteristics (Chu and Wood, 2008; Machado-da-Silva and Oliveira, 2001), we investigated the perceptions managers have about the influence of Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Assertiveness, Future Orientation, Performance Orientation, Jeitinho, Personalism, and Formalism in their managerial practices.

Analysis of the interviews and web survey showed that the cultural dimensions Uncertainty Avoidance and Assertiveness did influence the practices of the managers studied in a negative sense as compared to the practices considered dominant (Westwood, 2004) and in favor of Brazilian cultural characteristics, even after managers become internationalized. Differently, Power Distance, Future Orientation, and Performance Orientation increase with internationalization and more closely approximate the characteristics referenced as being on the Euro-American axis.

The local cultural characteristics Personalism and Formalism suffer influence from internationalization and are reflected in the managerial practices consolidating the Brazilian cul-

Fig.1 – Overview of study logic for comparative management analysis of Brazilian management practices
tural traces. In addition, the managerial practices derived from Jeitinho diminish with increases in a manager’s international experience and relationships.

Based upon the findings of this research, we believe that cultural dimensions of managerial practices can be used to gain insight into how manager’s perceptions demonstrate influences from dominant and indigenous cultural characteristics. For this study, it is particular to managers with international experience. Furthermore, it can demonstrate how cultural characteristics are influenced by increasing levels of international experience and relationships.

The sample size and levels of correlation encountered are limitations that need to be taken into account when analyzing the results. Due to this, we believe that the proposed methodology and framework presented can serve by helping ensure future research to: a) confirm the results for different samples in Brazil; b) compare the cultural dimensions of dominant practices in different samples or for different levels of internationalization (i.e. samples of managers without contact with the international market); c) compare the cultural dimensions of dominant practices with indigenous practices of other countries and even identify the presence of indigenous practices with international competitive advantages.
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