

Managing careers in the Brazilian public sector - possibilities and limitations in relation to the set of institutional factors in force

Miyahira, Ney Nakazato; & Fischer, André Luiz

Abstract

The adoption of meritocratic practices has been consolidated as a growing desire in the careers management, translating into a value system that proclaims equal opportunities and recognition of individual performance. It is worth emphasizing that any human resource practice will only be effective if it respects the institutional factors applicable to the organizational context. Therefore, it is extremely important to start any strategic formulation of career management based on an understanding of the panorama of institutional factors. This article investigates the careers management of the Brazilian public sector, conditioned to the influences of institutional factors. Thus, it is sought to identify which institutional factors are present and how their influence occurs, facilitating or hindering the prevalence of meritocratic practices.

Key words: institutional factors, public administration, career management.

Introduction

"Recognition of merit" seems to be the goal sought by current systems of recognition and career management in organizations (London & Stumph, 1982). An apparently simple premise gains layers of complexity as studies emerge to analyze their implications, assumptions, and impacts to individuals and organizations. Barbosa (2003, p.21) defines meritocracy as being "a set of values that postulates that the positions of individuals in society must be a consequence of the merit of each one. That is, the public recognition of the quality of individual achievements ... a set of values that rejects any form of hereditary and corporate privilege ... ". One can deduct from this definition the central notion of meritocracy as an ideology that defends the intention to reward those who stand out towards pre-established criteria.

Barbosa's studies further demonstrate that such definition gains specific contours depending on the context in which this ideology is applied. When meritocratic ideals are reinterpreted in the light of contingent factors characteristic of a given society, there is the formation of meritocratic systems conditioned to a given context (Barbosa, 2003). The influence of institutions is perceived, conceiving factors that restrict, direct, indicate and condition the meaning of merit and the way in which it should be valued.

Thus, meritocracy has a specific applicability, according to each context in which it is inserted, and its ideals are interpreted by the institutional factors in force. This research, when looking at career management in the Brazilian public sector, shows the constraints imposed on career management in Brazil and in the public sector, in particular. In order to do so, it is based on references from the Institutional Theory and Stakeholders Theory to understand the particular configuration of the meritocratic career system that has been intended to apply to this reality.

1. Theoretical Foundations

1.1 Institutional theory and the Brazilian configuration

North defined institutions as "the man-made constraints to shape human interactions" (North apud Kishtainy, 2013, p.) Thus, institutionalization is seen as a social process in which individuals accept social reality, independent of their own views (Scott apud Wright, 1992) and organizations, created and managed by individuals, are under pressure to acquire and maintain legitimacy in relation to the environment (Brookes et al., 2011).

Such pressure is what Wright (1992) has called non-strategic factors in people management: those factors that the manager does not have autonomy over them, such as legislation, trade union action, cultural values, certification bodies, among others. We find in this group of contingent variables the institutional factors, which are best explained by a specific theory of organizational management, institutional theory.

The institutionalization's theory is based on the idea that the various structures, programs and practices are legitimized by the social construction of reality and must correspond to it (Kishtainy, 2013). Thus, institutional factors consist of norms adopted by the institution or institutional attributes of its insertion context that interfere in the management practices, modifying their characteristics, shaping their meanings and their final objectives (Nascimento, Rodrigues & Megliorini, 2010).

According to Ramos (2012), the focus on institutions confers a more holistic perspective on the problem, bringing an evolutionary analysis, considering the mutations that have occurred over time to reach the current configuration, and the balance would not be natural and intuitive and that there would be clashes of interests between the different groups (agents acting in the economic field, but also in the social and political fields).

The institutional approach contributes to Strategic Management of Human Resources (SMHR) by pointing out that not all decisions are rational and that HR practices can in many cases be the result of social construction (Wright, 1992). Studies on the Latin American reality (Davilla & Elvira, 2012) show that contextual elements strongly present affect the configuration of HR practices and the formation and maintenance of the set of institutional factors in force: the role of the company as social institutions, the value of the individual in society and the pragmatism of public policies.

Martín-Alcázar, Romero-Fernández and Sánchez-Gardey (2005) present four perspectives of strategic HR management: the universal, the contingency, the configurational and the contextual. While the universalist perspective calls for the identification of best practices that can be applied to all situations, the contingency opposes it by believing that the HR effect for the business will depend on other variables. These are the so-called contingency variables that can be strategic, organizational or environmental and that condition the best fit of HR practices. On the other hand, the configurational perspective defends a systemic view of HR,

understanding that the arrangements and the interactivity between the practices is that they would bring synergistic effect. Finally, the contextual perspective gives attention to the external environment, suggesting that HR is both influenced and influences the organizational context in which it is inserted.

In this research, the contingency perspective was adopted. This is justified because it was intended to analyze the specific institutional factors of the public sector that interfere in the careers management by competence and it is considered that such factors can be included in what the authors of this theoretical line define as contingency variables (Brookes et al, 2011; Boyatziz, 1982; Dimaggio & Powell, 2005).

In the Brazilian case, the introduction of meritocratic criteria has always been characterized by a grant from the State to organizations (Barbosa, 2009). It can also be seen that it occurred late when compared to other countries (Barbosa, 2014). Added to this context are the elements of personal favoritism historically used since the Brazilian colonial period (Buarque de Holanda, 1935), the Brazilian geographic extension that favors emergence of subcultures and the different sectors of the public administration with their respective peculiarities: range (federal, state and municipal), power (executive, judicial and administrative), administration (direct and indirect). The result of this set of factors is that although the Brazilian public sector has shown an interest in adopting more meritocratic criteria in HR management, it does not occur in a homogeneous way.

It is to say that the traditional models, which are more adherent to the meritocratic ideals and which evade the strong criticism for greater performances and results (calculative model) present only partial solutions to the Brazilian reality. It is necessary to understand that there are distinct stakeholders that influence and are influenced by the model practiced and that, therefore, they impact in the formulation of the meritocratic system in force. Stakeholder theory

invites a horizontal view of the existing relationships between them, leaving aside the traditional hierarchical look of subordination and inviting the social inclusion of the different groups.

1.2 Stakeholder theory and the approach used

According to Freeman (1984), one of the seminal authors of this theory, stakeholder would be "any group or individual that affects or is affected by the attainment of organizational goals."

The same author (Freeman apud Friedman, 2006) argues that while most authors in the strategic planning area only glimpse stakeholders in exceptional situations, ignoring them in most of the proposed models (SWOT, Porter's Analysis, BCG Classification...), stakeholder theory questions whether the firm's objective function would be to serve only the shareholder or whether it should serve the interests of other stakeholders and thereby give these audiences a focus. It also questions the hierarchy of such services, including the reflection of corporate social responsibility, as opposed to the exclusive search for profit maximization.

Donaldson and Preston (1995) researched the stakeholders theory's approaches and classify them into three types: descriptive, instrumental and normative. While the first refers to the use of models by the firm to understand their role in different environments, to describe how organizations operate and explain specific behaviors of each; the instrumental aspect addresses how the firm uses the model as a management tool to identify interactions, or lack thereof, in the relationships between stakeholders and traditional firm, such as profitability and growth; and the last aspect, the normative one, focuses on the function of the company in society, even through the moral principles that guide its operations. Briefly, the theory reveals that the purpose of the company is to coordinate and manage stakeholder interests, the role of the company and its relationships.

In this article, we did not use stakeholder theory to describe all the actors involved in career management in the Brazilian public sector, nor how theory can map and instrumentalize the

manager to better manage relationships between stakeholders (although one of the conclusions of the article, by highlighting the manageable factor allows future studies to aggregate the instrumentalist approach of stakeholder theory to arrive at "how to handle such factors."). The use of stakeholder theory comes under the normative approach, evidencing the social role of the organisation and how strong this is in the Brazilian reality, making other issues, besides profit maximization (search for better performance and merit) will guide the design of the meritocratic system in force in Brazil.

Mitchell et al. (1997) suggest the classification of stakeholders according to three aspects: a) influence power over the organization; b) legitimacy of this influence; and c) urgency (importance and impact of their demands on the organization). But Davilla and Elvira's (2012) studies, in focusing on Latin American reality, challenge this more traditional view of stakeholder theory on salience and power and evidence the potential influence of values, perceptions, and actions of the organization's executives, bringing the focus to silents stakeholders, which are not so evident in Mitchell's (1997) approach, but which have great relevance in the Latin American and, therefore, Brazilian case. A crucial key stakeholder identified were the employees and the attention that organizations should give to them, their families and their communities.

1.3 The evolution of Brazilian Public Management

Analyzing the Brazilian case under the evolutionary perspective suggested by the institutional view, one can see that its efforts in adopting meritocratic practices, seen in the bureaucratic model (Weber & Pierucci, 2004), are recent and can be seen in two great State Reform movements: the 1930s and the one of 1990 (Pacheco, 2004; Bresser Pereira & Spink, 2006). Barbosa (2009) emphasizes that the formation of the Brazilian meritocratic system has been occurring exogenously to the values of Brazilian society. That is, the motivation for its adoption

does not necessarily stem from a claim of society; but rather it has been imposed strictly by means of legislation.

An understanding has been consolidated (Barbosa, 2003, 2009, 2014) that there is a Brazilian meritocracy, stimulated by institutional normative characteristics and shaped by other institutional and cultural characteristics. The extremely hierarchical, personal, relational and non-transparent nature of Brazilian public management makes meritocracy coexist with precepts of acquired rights, confrontations between professionalization, politicization and corporatism (Orsi & Silva, 2014).

The focus shifts from organizing the employee relationship and the role of HRM to HRM policies that influence social, work-related policies. Thus, the social contracts, which are expectations and mutual obligations between employees, employers and society in general, have been that in the public sector, career stability is expected, as well as continuous investments in employees, efforts to operate a system cooperative labor relations and community-centered corporate social responsibility practices. There is an implicit expectation that the public organization will take care of the career and development of the employee, as well as the conditions of their families and social environment. (Davilla & Elvira, 2012).

2. Methodology

For the research topic, through the institutional approach it was possible to identify if there were institutional factors that affected the application of meritocratic criteria in career management in the Brazilian public sector. And then to analyze how much these institutional factors acted as limiting or driving the application of meritocracy and if their influence is so intense that it allows to conclude by a contingencial vision of the practices, conditioned to given institutional context.

The applied methodology was qualitative, through case studies of career management application in institutions of the Government of Espírito Santo State (the Secretariat of Human Resources Management - SEGER, the Secretariat of Health - SESA and the Secretariat of Agriculture - SEAG). At these institutions, career restructuring projects were designed and implemented incorporating performance management practices by competencies. The original intention of the projects was to apply meritocratic criteria in HR decisions.

For the construction of the cases, two techniques of data collection were used: documentary analysis and qualitative interviews. The documentary analysis involved a thorough and exhaustive examination of the entire normative framework on the subject: general norms regulating the career, documents on principles and strategies, technical reports of the project of implantation of career management and norms regulating the careers created by the project or as a result of it. The interviews were carried out with servers involved in the implementation of career management and interviews with managers of the institutions, involved with the application of the formulated practices.

| Data source | Specifications |
|--|--|
| General rules governing the career | Federal Constitution 1988; Federal Law 8.429/92 (improbity); Federal Law 8.745/93 (hired for a fixed time); State Constitution of ES 1989; Complementary Law 46/94 (Statute of the public servant); Law 3043/75 (Administrative Reform of ES); Complementary Law 92/1996 (attendance and time of service); Decree 2554 (performance evaluation at probationary stage). |
| Strategic Plan Documents | Development Plan of ES for 2025; Strategic Plan of government of ES 2011-2014; Strategic Alignment of SEGER 2011 -2014. |
| Reports of Competency Management Project | Diagnostic Report (P1-I); Improvement Opportunities Report (P2-I). Adjustments in career structure Report (P2-II); Politics Report (P3-I); Legal Framework Report (P4-I); Geral Guidelines for career and remuneration Report (P6-IV) |
| Career Regulation standards created by or as a result of the project | Complementary Law 640 (promotion rules by selection); Complementary Law 637 (people managment policy) ; Complementary Law 519/12 (remuneration by subsidy); Complementary Law 633/12 (position of executive analyst); Complementary Law 634/12 (permanent allowance); Complementary Law 635/12 (position of specialist in public policies); Complementary Law 636/12 (promotion by seniority); Complementary Law 639/12 (rem SESA subsidy); Decree 3133/12 (individual performance guarantee); Decree 3264/13 (amend decree 3133). |
| Interviews with managers of SEGER | <u>Interview (SEGER):</u> Kátia Cyrlene de Araújo Vasconcelos – Undersecretary of State of Management of People Development – SUBGED. <u>Interview (SEGER):</u> Heyde dos Santos Lemos – Manager of Career and Server Development – GECADS..Former HR analyst and integrated the project Coordination Team. <u>Interview (SEGER):</u> Angélica Maria Torres – Analyst of the Executive of Career Management and Server Development - GECADS. He was an analyst and integrated the project coordination team. |
| Interviews with managers of SESA and SEAG | <u>Interview (SEAG - IDAF):</u> Josicleia Zanelato - Responsible for the Performance Management of IDAF Accompanied the project team and participated in the modeling groups. <u>Interview (SEAG - IDAF):</u> Wagner Rocha - Head of Human Resources at IDAF. He has lived the implementation of the project, participated in the modeling groups and acts as manager in the application of the new practices of career management. |

| Data source | Specifications |
|-------------|---|
| | <p><u>Interview (SEAG - INCAPER):</u> Hildeneia Ribeiro Patrício - Responsible for the Performance Management of INCAPER. Accompanied the project team, participated in the modeling groups.</p> <p><u>Interview (SEAG - INCAPER):</u> Janaina Paulino - Human Resources Analyst at INCAPER. Accompanies the application of new career management practices.</p> <p><u>Interview (SEAG - INCAPER):</u> Dr. José Aires Ventura - Head of the research area of INCAPER. He has lived the implementation of the project, participated in the modeling groups and acts as manager in the application of the new practices of career management.</p> <p><u>Interview (SESA):</u> Fátima Sardenberg - Responsible for the Performance Management of SESA. Accompanies the application of new career management practices.</p> |

Table 1: Specifying data sources.

Source: Prepared by the author.

For the analysis of data, four strategies were used, applied sequentially, as stages of the analysis (Yin, 2010):

- a) To have theoretical propositions - it is the rescue of the original objectives of the project, the research questions posed by them, the literature reviews and the new hypotheses. The research object is the study of attempts to apply meritocratic criteria in the career of the public servant and institutional factors that influence such application.
- b) Develop the description of the case - it is the descriptive structuring of the topics to be approached in the research and that allows a logical organization and a systemic presentation of the data collected.
- c) Using quantitative and qualitative data - combining the two types of data helps to enrich the research. In the subject treated, quantitative data were collected on the percentages of career progressions and promotions granted both by meritocratic criteria and by non-meritocratic criteria, the time in career development, the number of possible steps to advance in a meritocratic movement, and the career span. As for the qualitative data, they came from the perceptions of justice and fairness, the pleadings of adjustments and the degree of satisfaction of the servers in relation to the current career standards, data collected by the interviews.
- d) Think about rival explanations - is to consider contrasting perspectives to the hypotheses formulated. In the research on meritocracy in the career, it implies to observe if the consequences of the attempts to use meritocratic criteria have, in fact, causal relations

with the institutional factors previously listed. At this stage, special attention must be paid to the separation between collected data and interpretations, so as to guarantee the empirical character and enable the researcher to observe the required impartiality.

Finally, a classification system was adopted that allowed to categorize the institutional factors as to the type of influence exerted by them in the HR decisions and career management practices, in particular. They were defined as: (1) facilitators of meritocratic practices, (2) difficult to implement or (3) manageable. The "manageable" category was applied to factors that in isolation and focused analysis, do not facilitate or hinder the meritocratic nature of the practice in its essence, and can be used by the manager if he so decides. In these cases, therefore, the adoption of meritocratic practices would depend on the discretionary power of managers.

3. Research Results

The ES State comprises an area of 46,078 km², with a population of 3,578,067 and a nominal GDP of R \$ 69.5 billion (Espírito Santo State Government, 2010). Espírito Santo's economy is based on agriculture, livestock and mining. The structure of the government comprises the governor, the deputy governor and 26 secretariats, under the coordination of the governor. In addition to the secretariats, there are also municipalities, public companies and foundations, which assist in the management of policies related to each secretariat. The total number of servers of the executive power of Espírito Santo is 91,421, with 56,099 active servers and 35,322 pensioners and retirees.

Until 2010, what happened as a people management practice of the state government of the ES was an eminently cartorial action, without an adequate organizational structure for the development of its processes. The organization of the positions and careers in these secretariats occurred in an atomized and isolated manner, coexisting both the situation of secretariats with positions directly related to them, and transversal tables, linked to the Secretariat of

Management (SEGER) and allocated to the different departments for the execution of their duties. Faced with this situation, the government of the State of Espírito Santo carried out a project to formulate the People Management Policy in 2011/2012 and, among the different actions planned, there was an intention to reformulate the career management, adopting meritocratic criteria.

The research is positioned after this project, allowing both the analysis and identification of institutional factors prior to the project, and institutional factors (or reinforcements or mitigations) arising from the project. It is worth mentioning that this project released standards to all the servers of the State Government of the ES and the deployments occurred gradually. The Secretaries SEGER, SESA and SEAG were chosen for this research because the first one had an active participation in the conduction of the project and the others were the first to accept the changes.

The case study made it possible to identify 16 institutional factors, that placed in the light of the proposed classification, identified: 5 facilitators, 4 difficulties and 7 manageable (Table 2), pointing out that to a large extent, factors facilitate or are available to managers to influence in favor of meritocratic management, demystifying the understanding that in the Brazilian public sector there are greater obstacles to meritocratic practices.

| Institutional Factor | Description |
|--|--|
| Factor 1: Guarantee of Impersonality and Equality ➡ | Preserves formal equality (all equal towards law). |
| Factor 2: Entry into the public career via public exam ↔ | It is required the application of public exam (tests written or practical) or exam and analysis of titles for the entrance into the public career. |
| Factor 3: Legislation ↔ | The actions of the public agents and of the Administration must be foreseen by law, that is, there must be formalization in normative devices. |
| Factor 4: Ethical and Efficient posture ➡ | The actions of the public agents and the Administration must respect the ethical precepts and seek the efficiency in the exercise of their competences. |
| Factor 5: Legislation of choosing criteria ↔ | The public administration uses as one of the performance's criteria the education of the individual. |
| Factor 6: Exceptions of public exam ↔ | The possibility of commission position ruled by free appointment and the temporary contracting of exceptional public interest weaken the figure of the public exam. |
| Factor 7: Transient condition of managers ← | In the public sector, the norms of the positions in commission confer the managers' transience, causing difficulty in the full appropriation of the management role. |
| Factor 8: Search for economic equality ↔ | Establishment of remuneration ceilings, more conservative salary ranges, and isonomic treatment of groups of public servants limit individual treatment and condition an internal equity analysis. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Factor 9: Guarantee of career stability ← | For public servants are guaranteed a strong career stability, which is one of the great attractions in the public career. |
| Factor 10: Productivity enhancement intent ↔ | Legal devices provide for the measurement and recognition of server productivity. |
| Factor 11: Legislation of seniority criteria ← | Career management in the public sector is under pressure to emphasize seniority, as a criterion of recognition in the career and confirmation of server loyalty. |
| Factor 12: Commitment to create a strategic plan → | The formalization of planning and management documents provides guidelines and parameters to be followed by the government. |
| Factor 13: Discontinuation of management policies with the exchange of heads of the Executive Power ← | The cyclical process of management change, with the polarized form with which the elections occur, confers a risk of discontinuity of strategic actions, when these are seen in a personalized way, according to the figure of each head of the executive or his political party. |
| Factor 14: Valorization of the public servant as a strategic attempt → | Explanation of the strategic intention to value the public servant stimulates actions related to career management. |
| Factor 15: Requirement of transparent and financially responsible acts → | The actions of the public agents must be marked by the economic and financial balance and publicity of the quantitative and qualitative information about such acts. |
| Factor 16: Engagement of trade unions and associations ↔ | Existence of organized and mobilized associations and unions that condition and influence the strategic decisions of the government. |

Table 2: Institutional factors identified, their description and type of influence.

Source: prepared by the author.

Once the classification of each institutional factor as a facilitator, difficult or manageable factor for meritocratic management can be classified, the factors found in the case study can be classified in the categories proposed by Dimaggio and Powell (2005): coercive (imposed by law), normative (adopted by professional practices) and mimetic (imitation of practices made by all). For the purposes of this research, the normative and mimetic categories were grouped.

| Institutional Factors | Classification by Dimaggio and Powell's Category (2005) |
|---|---|
| Factor 1: Guarantee of Impersonality and Equality → | Coercive |
| Factor 2: Entry into the public career via public exam ↔ | Coercive |
| Factor 3: Legislation ↔ | Coercive |
| Factor 4: Ethical and Efficient posture → | Coercive |
| Factor 5: Legislation of choosing criteria ↔ | Coercive |
| Factor 6: Exceptions of public exam ↔ | Coercive |
| Factor 7: Transient condition of managers ← | Normative / Mimetic |
| Factor 8: Search for economic equality ↔ | Coercive |
| Factor 9: Guarantee of career stability ← | Coercive |
| Factor 10: Productivity enhancement intent ↔ | Normative / Mimetic |
| Factor 11: Legislation of seniority criteria ← | Coercive |
| Factor 12: Commitment to create a strategic plan → | Normative / Mimetic |
| Factor 13: Discontinuation of management policies with the exchange of heads of the Executive Power ← | Normative / Mimetic |
| Factor 14: Valorization of the public servant as a strategic attempt → | Normative / Mimetic |
| Factor 15: Requirement of transparent and financially responsible acts → | Normative / Mimetic |

| Institutional Factors | Classification by Dimaggio and Powell's Category (2005) |
|---|---|
| Factor16: Engagement of trade unions and associations ↔ | Normative / Mimetic |

Table 3: Classification of institutional factors by the category of Dimaggio and Powell (2005).
Source: prepared by the author.

It is possible to verify that the fact of being coercive or normative / mimetic, does not impact the classification of facilitator, difficult or manageable, with incidence of the three types in each type of classification of Dimaggio and Powell (2005).

After the classification of the 16 institutional factors, it was then verified the fact of the impact of the factors in the implementation of the management of career by competences, is shown in the table below:

| Institutional Factors | Classification by analysis of the norms and principles | Impact Assessment |
|--|--|---|
| Factor 1: Guarantee of Impersonality and Equality | Facilitator → | "Automating Performance Evaluation" Facilitator |
| Factor 2: Entry into the public career via public exam | Manageable ↔ | "Normative constraints inherent in the public sector" Difficult |
| Factor 3: Legislation | Manageable ↔ | "Normative constraints inherent in the public sector" "Difficulty in implementing complementary norms" "Lack of budgetary controls provided by law" Difficult |
| Factor 4: Ethical and Efficient posture | Facilitator → | "Automating Performance Evaluation" Facilitator |
| Factor 5: Legislation of chooling criteria | Manageable ↔ | "Skew application of performance evaluation" "Unbridled stimulus to training" Difficult |
| Factor 6: Exceptions of public exam | Manageable ↔ | "Normative constraints inherent in the public sector" Difficult |
| Factor 7: Transient condition of managers | Difficult ← | "Normative constraints inherent in the public sector" "Skew application of performance evaluation" "Decommissioning and difficulty of managers and managers in the application of meritocratic criteria" Difficult |
| Factor 8: Search for economic equality | Manageable ↔ | "Strong government policy" "Normative constraints inherent in the public sector" Facilitator and Difficult |
| Factor 9: Guarantee of career stability | Difficult ← | "Normative constraints inherent in the public sector" "Skew application of performance evaluation" Difficult |

| Institutional Factors | | Classification by analysis of the norms and principles | Impact Assessment |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| Factor 10: | Productivity enhancement intent | Manageable ↔ | "Normative constraints inherent in the public sector" "Difficulty in implementing complementary norms" Difficult |
| Factor 11: | Legislation of seniority criteria | Difficult ← | "Normative constraints inherent in the public sector" "Skew application of performance evaluation" Difficult |
| Factor 12: | Commitment to create a strategic plan | Facilitator → | "Strong government policy" "Automating Performance Evaluation" Facilitator |
| Factor 13: | Discontinuation of management policies with the exchange of heads of the Executive Power | Difficult ← | "Project was a government action" "Financial constraints" "Exclusive concern with cost savings" "Difficulty of implementation and complementary norms" Difficult |
| Factor 14: | Valorization of the public servant as a strategic attempt | Facilitator → | "Strong government policy" "Technically supported and dedicated HR team" "Interest of the servers and union in participating in the modeling groups" "Automating Performance Evaluation" Facilitator |
| Factor 15: | Requirement of transparent and financially responsible acts | Facilitator → | "Interest of the servers and union in participating in the modeling groups" Facilitator |
| Factor 16: | Engagement of trade unions and associations | Manageable ↔ | "Interest of the servers and union in participating in the modeling groups" "Difficulty of understanding what meritocracy is" Facilitator and Difficult |
| Others Factors | Managerial Culture | Not applicable | "Skew application of performance evaluation" "Decommissioning and difficulty of managers and managers in the application of meritocratic criteria" "Difficulty of understanding what meritocracy is" "Difficulty in the performance evaluation scale adopted" Difficult |
| | Deployment Process | Not applicable | "Problems in project communication and career rules" "Misalignment between human resources areas" "Accelerated project rhythm, preventing the decoupling between performance management and decisions for promotion" Difficult |

Table 4: Institutional Factors, its classification and its impact assessment.
Source: prepared by the author.

It is possible to perceive that the five institutional factors facilitating the adoption of meritocratic practices are active at the points indicated as facilitators of meritocratic practices. The same can be said of the four institutional factors hindering the adoption of meritocratic practices, they appear in the reported obstacles. As for the manageable factors, of the seven that exist, only one of them appears to have repercussions on a facilitation of meritocratic practices,

factor 16 - union engagement, indicating that public sector management finds it difficult to use manageable institutional factors in favor of meritocratic management.

Of the manageable factors that in practice acted as impediments, it is worth noting the factors 8 - economic equality and 16 - union engagement, which had both favorable and unfavorable actions to the application of meritocracy. The institutional factor 8 served as a facilitator in regulating and propagating the remuneration model by subsidy as a government guideline. But the same factor positions itself as a hindrance to having restricted particularized treatments, necessary to treat the specificities. In the case of factor 16, it was favorable, as unions and associations were interested in discussing career and recognition, but unfavorable because they had a distinct understanding of meritocracy, approaching the anti-militarist discourse, identified by Barbosa (2014).

Finally, it is possible to perceive from the interview reports that some obstacles occurred due to the way in which the implantation process occurred or still occasioned by the existing managerial culture. Although they are two characteristics that are not configured as institutional factors, they exerted influences on the model and deserve to be mentioned.

Final Considerations

The research proved to be relevant for constructing a proposal for a model of analysis of the influence of institutional factors and to conclude that the implementation of the competency management model produced different effects from what was originally proposed. This is due to the influence of institutional factors. It also has relevance to the theory by highlighting a third category of institutional factor: the manageable. It was based on the intention to identify and classify factors as facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of more meritocratic career management and reached a third type, which a priori does not impel or restrict the adoption of

merit: but it grants discretion to that the public managers conduct the process according to their attempts.

It is hoped that this research has contributed to demystify the perception that the public sector is an arid and incongruent field of meritocratic management practices. Although there are normative and restrictive assumptions, they do not lead to a complete plastering or total automatic impossibility of this management. There is room for public administrators to manage several institutional factors and succeed in deploying meritocracy.

References

Barbosa, L. (2003). **Igualdade e meritocracia**. Rio de Janeiro: FGV.

_____. (2009). **Cultura e diferença nas organizações: reflexões sobre nós e os outros**. São Paulo: Atlas.

_____. (2014) Meritocracia e Sociedade Brasileira. **RAE – Revista de Administração de Empresas**. v.54, n.1, p. 80-85.

Boyatziz, R. E. (1982). **The competent management a model for effective performance**. Nova York: Wiley & Sons.

Bresser Pereira, L. C.; & Spink, P. (orgs.) (2006). **Reforma do Estado e administração pública gerencial**. Rio de Janeiro, FGV.

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**. v. 21 n.1, p. 68-79.

Buarque de Holanda, S. (1995) **Raízes do Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio.

Conselho Nacional de Educação. (1999). **Resolução CNE/CEB N.04/99**.

- Davilla, A.; & Elvira, M. M. (2012). Latin American HRM Models. In: Brewster, C.; & Mayrhofer, W. **Handbook of Research on Comparative Human Resource Management**. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Dimaggio P. J.; & Powell, W.W. (2005). A gaiola de ferro revisitada: isomorfismo institucional e racionalidade coletiva nos campos organizacionais. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**. v.45, n.2, p. 74-89.
- Donaldson, T.; & Preston, L. E. (1995). **The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence and implications**. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 65-91.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). **Strategic management: a stakeholder approach**. Boston: Pitman.
- Friedman, A. L.; Miles, S. (2006). **Stakeholders: theory and practice**. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Kishtainy, N.; Abbot, G.; Fardon, J.; Weeks, M.; Meadway, J.; Wallace, C.; Kennedy, F. (2013). **O LIVRO DA ECONOMIA**. [tradução Carlos S. Mendes Rosa]. São Paulo: Globo.
- London, M.; & Stumph, S. (1982). **Managing careers**. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Martín-Alcázar, F., Romero-Fernández, P. M., & Sánchez-Gardey, G. (2005). Strategic human resource management: integrating the universalistic, contingent, configurational and contextual perspectives. **The International Journal of Human Resource Management**. v.6, n.5, p. 633-659.
- Mitchell, R. K.; Agle, B. R.; Wood, D. J. (1997). **Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts**. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 853-886.
- Nascimento, G. C.; Rodrigues, V. J.; & Megliorini, E. (2010). Conceitos da Teoria institucional: fonte propulsora de evolução para a gestão de desempenho. **XVII Congresso Brasileiro de Custos**. Belo Horizonte.

- Orsi, A.; & Silva, C. M (2014). Gestão de Desempenho no setor público: dificuldades e alternativas de solução. In: Teixeira, H. J.; Bassoti, I. M.; Santos, T. S (org.). **Mérito, Desempenho e Resultados: ensaio sobre gestão de pessoas para o setor público**. São Paulo:FIA/USP.
- Pacheco, R. S. (2004). Contratualização de resultados no setor público: a experiência brasileira e o debate internacional. **Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública**, Madri: 2004.
- Ramos, C. A. (2012). **Economia do Trabalho: modelos teóricos e o debate no Brasil**.Curitiba:CRV, Cap. 12 (pp 399428).
- Yin, R. K. (2010). Estudo de Caso: Planejamento e Métodos. 4 ed. Porto Alegre: Bookman
- Weber. M.; & Pierucci, A. F. (2004). **A ética protestante e o ‘espírito’ do capitalismo**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Wright, P. M.; & McMahan, G. C. (1992) Theoretical Perspectives for Strategic Human Resource Management. **Journal of Management**. v. 18. n.2, p. 295–320.