Revista de Administração da UFSM
ISSN: 1983-4659
Universidade Federal de Santa Maria

Penz, Daniel; Almeida, Mathias Picollo de; Amorim, Bianca Costa; Cembranel, Priscila; Rolt, Carlos Roberto de

Crowdsourced employer branding: an analysis from the platform *glassdoor*

Revista de Administração da UFSM, vol. 16, no. 1, e7, 2023
Universidade Federal de Santa Maria

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5902/1983465966608

Available in: https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=273476411007

UFSM

ReA UFSM
Revista de Administração da UFSM

ISSN 1983-4659
OPEN ACCESS

Rev. Adm. UFSM, Santa Maria, v. 16, n. 1, e7, 2023 https://doi.org/10.5902/1983465966608
Submitted: 20/06/2022 • Approved: 11/12/2022 • Published: 29/03/2023

Crowdsourced employer branding: an analysis from the platform *glassdoor*

Crowdsourced employer branding: uma análise a partir da plataforma *glassdoor*

Daniel Penz [I], Mathias Picollo de Almeida [I], Bianca Costa Amorim [II], Priscila Cembranel [III, IV], Carlos Roberto de Rolt [V]

[I] Faculdade CESUSC, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil
[II] Fundação CERTI, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil
[III] Universidade do Contestado, Mafra, Santa Catarina, Brazil
[IV] Sociedade Educacional de Santa Catarina, Jaraguá do Sul, Santa Catarina, Brazil
[V] Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The present study aims to evaluate the aspects of organizational climate and culture from the voluntary contributions published in the *Crowdsourced Employer Branding Glassdoor.*
Design/methodology: Methodologically, this is an applied, descriptive longitudinal retrospective research, with a quantitative and qualitative approach to data, whose collection took place by means of a technical survey procedure with interpretative analysis of *Glassdoor* users' statements. The sample was composed of 5 companies from the technological sector located in the city of Florianópolis-SC.
Findings: The study investigates the organizational culture from the observations obtained on Glassdoor, verify the difference in averages between Culture and General Note of the companies observed, the perception of climate from the manifestations in favor or against the practices of the organization and relate the culture and organizational climate of the sample studied.
Originality/value: Theoretically, the study points out the possibilities of evaluating the organizational climate and culture through *Crowdsourced Employer Branding* platforms and that the "culture" factor is a determining factor for the positive or negative evaluation of a company. In relation to practical contributions, it can be seen that the study contributes to the decision of candidates about which companies to work for. In addition, it brings the importance of companies developing a good culture and maintaining a good organizational climate. Considering that this information is accessible to people on the internet.

Keywords: Organizational climate; Organizational culture; *Crowdsourcing; Employer branding*

RESUMO

Finalidade: O presente estudo tem como objetivo avaliar os aspectos de clima e cultura organizacional a partir das contribuições voluntárias publicadas na plataforma de *Crowdsourced Employer Branding Glassdoor.*

Desenho/metodologia: Metodologicamente trata-se de uma pesquisa aplicada, descritiva longitudinal retrospectiva, com uma abordagem quantitativa e qualitativa dos dados, cuja coleta se deu por meio de procedimento técnico de levantamento com análise interpretativa das afirmações dos usuários do *Glassdoor.* A amostra foi composta por 5 empresas do setor tecnológico localizadas na cidade de Florianópolis-SC, que teve caráter prático,

Constatações: O estudo investiga a cultura organizacional a partir das observações obtidas no *Glassdoor*, verificar a diferença de médias entre a Cultura e a Nota Geral das empresas observadas, a percepção de clima a partir das manifestações a favor ou contra as práticas da organização e relacionar a cultura e o clima organizacional da amostra estudada.

Originalidade/valor: Teoricamente, o estudo aponta as possibilidades de avaliar o clima e cultura organizacional por meio de plataformas de *Crowdsourced Employer Branding* e que o fator "cultura" é determinante para a avaliação positiva ou negativa de uma empresa. Em relação às contribuições práticas, percebe-se que o estudo contribui com a decisão de candidatos frente as empresas para trabalhar. Além disso, traz a importância de as empresas desenvolverem uma boa cultura e manterem um bom clima organizacional. Tendo em vista que essas informações estão acessíveis para as pessoas na internet.

Palavras-chave: Clima organizacional; Cultura organizacional; *Crowdsourcing; Employer branding*

1 INTRODUCTION

Organizational efficiency depends on the activities performed by the people who make it up and produce its results (Flores, 2016). Organizational climate and culture are intangible, but can be perceived by how employees evaluate the policies and procedures by the company. When these employees are engaged, teams feel valued and become more productive. Otherwise, a bad organizational climate and a negative perception of the company's culture will negatively affect the employees' well-being, their productivity, and consequently harm the organization's results and development (Poncio, 2017).

Culture is a guiding horizon of behaviors and practices, beliefs and values to which the employees of an organization must adapt. The concepts and cultural patterns of organizations have influence on the emergence of organizational climate. This can be considered a set of characteristics, values or attitudes that affect the relationship of people. The climate is the result of the elements of culture (Rocha & Pelogio, 2014)

In this context, one realizes the importance of knowing how people feel before the internal and external factors that involve their work environment and the company.

According to Suen, Hung, and Tsen (2020), being able to know in advance the culture and climate of a company can be a determining factor in the adaptation of an employee and avoid future dissatisfactions. For, these factors impact the management of the organization and the interaction between employees.

In research conducted by the authors it was possible to verify the existence of several digital platforms for job classification and company assessments. Such as: linkedin.com.br; empregos.com.br; catho.com.br among others, these are used by candidates to search for a new job, to verify comments from employees or former employees about the companies they worked for.

Considering the use of these platforms, the study was developed from the following guiding question: *" It is possible to assess a company's climate through open crowdsource tools?".* The general objective comprised the evaluation of the organizational climate and its relation to organizational culture, from the voluntary contributions published in the *Crowdsourced Employer Branding Glassdoor*.

This article is organized in the following chapters: Company Description, Theoretical Framework, Methodology, Analysis and Discussion of Results, Conclusions and References.

2 CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Organizational culture is a way in which each organization collectively deals with problems of external adaptation and internal integration (Schein, 1989; Saini & Jawahar, 2019). It is the set of beliefs, customs, values, behavioral norms, and ways of doing business defined by each company (Robbins, 2005).

According to Crozati (1998), the most frequently cited elements in relation to culture are: Values, rites, rituals and ceremonies, norms, taboos, and the heroes that embody the values and drive organizational strength.

Bergamini & Coda (2006) establish culture as one of the key points in understanding human actions. It is implicit and yet known to all members of an

organization and arises through history, practices, norms, and symbols. Moreover, it changes over time and with the entry of new people into the company.

Culture is known to produce positive and negative effects on the level of employee satisfaction (Bitsani, 2013) in addition to contributing to power relations and being a determinant of organizational outcomes (Punina, 2016).

Climate is a comprehensive and complex concept that varies according to each author's view (Curvo & Heinzmann, 2017). It is known, however, that it is used to describe people's perceptions of the organizations in which they work (Rizzatti, 2002), because it usually summarizes perceptions of different subjects (Sbragia, 1983) and indicates how the context affects the behavior and attitudes of people in the work environment (Siqueira, 2008).

It can also be talked about, the "quality or property of the organizational environment, which is perceived or experienced by members of the organization and influences their behavior" and can be considered as psychological atmosphere among employees of a company (Luz, 2003, p.10).

In addition, it can address the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of employees about their work in the company, the appreciation of employees in the environment, and the assessment of the needs of individuals (Iglesias Armenteros, Torres Esperón & Mora Pérez, 2020).

Climate surveys are important. In particular because they raise indicators to analyze the companies and seek improvements in the internal environment, solve dissatisfactions and productivity problems (Punina, 2018)

The relationship between culture and climate is also discussed in the literature. For Luz (2003), culture is the cause, climate is the consequence. According to the author, culture are recurring practices established at a certain time, while climate is something temporal. Climate is measured through surveys, observations, or interviews on the internal and external perspectives. Culture communicates with behavioral expectations to the employees of a work unit (Iglesias Armenteros, Torres Esperón & Mora Pérez, 2020).

The formation of organizational climate is directly linked with the culture that the organization has, when the culture changes, the climate is also changed. This can generate insecurity, decrease the productive capacity, and generate internal conflicts in the organization. Thus, it is understood that culture is an intrinsic concept of behavior of groups and climate represents the perception of a group at a given time (Bitsani, 2013). And, both culture and organizational climate are associated with service quality and results in all organizational environments (Ouellette, 2020).

3 CROWDSOURCING E EMPLOYER BRANDING

The term *crowdsource* refers to collaborative social interaction, based on the process of obtaining services, ideas or content through contributions from a community, usually online, rather than using common means such as a team of employees. These are solutions from volunteers, experts or small businesses (Bittencourt & Moraes Filho, 2014; Aparicio, Costa & Braga, 2012).

Brabham (2013) defines *crowdsourcing* as an online, distributed production and problem-solving model whose goal is to aggregate information and solutions for businesses and academics to facilitate decision-making and research (Estellés-Arolas and Ladrón-de-Guevara, 2012; Landers, Bruso & Auer, 2019).

Employer Branding can be loosely translated as "employer branding". It refers to an organization's reputation as an employer. It can be defined as the functional, economic, and psychological benefits that are provided by the employment relationship based on the experience of current and former employees. These benefits are also called the employee value proposition. It concerns how employees feel about the organization they work for (Sueng, Hung & Tseng, 2020).

Effective *Employer Branding* enables an employer to differentiate and promote itself in the face of competitors, reduce talent acquisition costs, improve working relationships, and increase employee engagement with employers (Sueng, Hung & Tseng, 2020).

According to Saini and Jawahar (2019), the *Employer Branding* has two main target audiences: internal employees (current and former employees) and job applicants. Internal employees contribute to *Employer Branding* indicators by responding about what they find, observe, or feel in an organization. Candidates, on the other hand, can use this information to decide about applying for certain jobs. Especially when they don't know the company.

Similarly, employers can also contribute to *Employer Branding* by collecting and analyzing the experiences of employees. This can be done through exit interviews and climate surveys. For some reason, employers find it difficult to obtain information because internal employees may fear negative repercussions if they share something inappropriately (Sueng, Hung & Tseng, 2020).

Social media has brought the opportunity for its users to share their experiences online with positive and negative remarks. In this context, the number of candidates who read these reviews and meet potential employers before applying for jobs or accepting an offered job is growing (Dabirian, Kietzmann & Diba, 2017).

Dabirian, Kietzmann, and Diba (2017) point out that this is positive for candidates. For, they can transparently brand employers according to anonymous ratings and comments from their internal employees. Nowadays, this kind of platform is a determining factor in whether a particular organization is a great place to work.

One example of a successful *Crowdsourced Employer Branding* is *Glassdoor*, whose business model focuses on maintaining a database of employer ratings. With over 50 million visitors per month, about 86% of registered candidates research company reviews and ratings for different job attributes before applying for a position. Currently, the platform has 70 million employee reviews covering more than 1.3 million companies in 200 countries (Glassdor, 2021).

Glassdoor provides participant reviews of CEO approval ratings, positive business outlook, whether they would recommend to a friend, allowing evaluation of indicators such as overall outlook, culture and values, quality of work life, top leadership, compensation and benefits, and career opportunities, based on a 5-

point scale (1: very dissatisfied, 2: dissatisfied, 3: Okay, 4: satisfied, and 5: very satisfied). The overall rating reflects overall job satisfaction, while the other specific ratings reflect job satisfaction with respect to each factor. Since job satisfaction reflects employees' experience with their employers, the different ratings of *crowdsourcing* no *Glassdoor* would be valid indicators de *Employer Branding* (Sueng, Hung & Tseng, 2020). In addition, studies by Dabirian, Kietzmann, and Diba (2017) point out that effective *Employer Branding* leads to positive electronic word of mouth (e-WOM), causing the company to be perceived as a good place to work, while negative word of mouth has the opposite effect, causing employees not to recommend the employer as a good employment choice.

Suen, Hung e Tseng (2020) complement that even though they have higher employer ratings in the Glassdoor, text mining from posted comments (pros and cons) can identify important insights into whether employees are satisfied or dissatisfied. In turn, this information can generate opportunities to improve Employer Branding and create a positive employee experience overall.

4 METHODOLOGY

The study is developed through a quali-quantitative, longitudinal descriptive approach of sectional cut and survey procedure.

Information on variables was collected and described in a period prior to October 15, 2020.

The population of this study comprises startups located in Florianópolis/SC. Private companies in the technology industry were the object of this study. The criterion for choosing companies was the number of evaluations available on the Glassdoor website. The number of evaluations could not be too high or too low, to avoid that a possible disparity in the number of evaluations among the companies could influence the results obtained. Thus, it was defined that companies that had between 50 and 150 available evaluations would be selected. This profile included

the following companies: E3, E4, E5, E6 and E7. The companies E1, with 612 answers, and E2, with 315 answers, were excluded due to the high volume of observations that could bias the research, since they alone would represent more answers than all the companies combined. A total of 465 valid evaluations were collected from the 5 selected companies, and the larger companies were excluded from the sample to avoid a very strong bias in the results due to the number of evaluations. The data collection on the site was done without the aid of software. The number of evaluations, average score, and recommendations can be seen in Chart 1:

Chart 1 – List of companies with more than 50 climate-related remarks on Glassdoor

Company Name	Evaluations	Available Evaluations	Recommend to a friend	Average grade
E1	612	Company excluded from the sample because of its size		
E2	315	Company excluded from the sample because of its size		
E3	199	149	93%	4,1
E4	91	90	64%	3,3
E5	98	90	88%	4,1
E6	75	72	96%	4,6
E7	67	64	82%	3,7
Average per company of the evaluated sample	93		85%	3,96
Total Evaluations		**465**		

Source: site Glassdoor.com (2021)

With the list of companies with more than fifty observations, positive and negative characteristics were mapped. Thus, to better visualize the results, Chart 2 was constructed. It presents positive and negative key words of the characteristics that influence the climate of the companies.

From this stage on, two analysis tools were used. For the quantitative analysis the IBM SPSS software version 22 was used in order to perform the descriptive analysis and establish the most relevant correlation to determine the

company's overall score. These are the result of a one-way anova that verified the difference in means between the grades given by the evaluators. The other analyses were performed with the help of Excel from Office 365.

Chart 2 – List of positive and negative keywords in the sample companies

Company	Positive keywords	Negative keywords
E3	Relaxed environment, Autonomy to work, High tech, Flexibility, Benefits, Culture	Poor communication, Lack of growth opportunity, Low pay, Unprepared management
E4	Pleasant environment, Opportunity for personal development, Infrastructure, location.	Low pay, Lack of growth opportunity, Outdated equipment and software, Lack of innovation, Culture.
E5	Relaxed environment, Benefits, Freedom, Training, Opportunity for growth.	Low pay, Poor communication, Lack of growth opportunity, Disorganization, Lack of recognition.
E6	Friendly environment, Flexibility, Culture, Horizontal hierarchy, Benefits, People-oriented management.	Constant change of focus, little innovation, inexperienced leadership.
E7	Infrastructure, Benefits, Good work environment, Location, Learning opportunity.	Low salary, Lack of recognition, Lack of focus, Family management, Lack of growth opportunities.

Source: Glassdor, 2021

5 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The analysis was done by collecting anonymous testimonials from employees who work or have had some previous experience in the companies that are part of this study, and also the grades that these employees gave for different factors that may affect the level of organizational climate. Keywords were captured only in evaluations that had phrases related to possible agents of influence on the organizational climate, as well as 6 factors available for evaluation by score on the *Glassdoor* platform: company's "general" score; "quality of life" score; "culture and values" score; "career opportunities" score; "compensation and benefits" score, and "top leadership" score, in addition to the perspective that the employee has or had before the company.

For the **quantitative frequency analysis** a total of 465 evaluations of the 5 companies that are part of this study were available for viewing on *Glassdoor.com*. 149 reviews of the company E3, 90 reviews of the company E4, 90 reviews of the company E5, 72 reviews of the company E6 and 64 reviews of the company E7.

In the quantitative analysis the evaluations of these companies were added and analyzed as a whole, and not individually, because the objective of the study is to analyze the factors that may influence the level of organizational climate in companies in the technology sector located in Florianopolis, and not in each of the companies in specific.

In relation to the **positive and negative observations**, the evaluations that had or did not have positive and/or negative observations regarding the organizational climate of the company that the candidate evaluated were considered. Of the 465 available evaluations, 410 had positive observations regarding the climate (88.2%), and 299 had negative observations (64.3%). It can be seen that a large part of the employees had good and/or bad observations regarding factors that can influence the level of organizational climate within companies. There is a higher percentage of positive observations compared to negative observations, which suggests that, on average, there are more factors that positively affect the organizational climate within the analyzed companies.

With regard to **quality of life** within the work environment, it was considered the degree of satisfaction of personal needs that the employee can obtain while performing his or her job. From the total of evaluations, 98.1% had evaluations referring to quality of life. 73.2% of the evaluations were positive, with 45.6% of the valid answers getting 5 stars and 27.6% getting 4 stars. The total average was 4.02, the highest among the factors analyzed, which indicates that the quality of life at work is one of the strengths of the companies analyzed. The standard deviation was 1.143 and the variance was 1.307, which indicates an even higher degree than the general score of amplitude in the answers, with maximum and minimum scores.

The score regarding **culture** refers to the employees' perception of the company's organizational culture.

With regard to **organizational culture** from the observations obtained on Glassdoor, it is possible to state that of the 465 evaluations, 456 (98.1%) had evaluations referring to culture, that is, culture is perceived as one of the most important measures of the organization in the anonymous opinion of its employees. Its distribution: 217 of these companies were evaluated with 5 stars (47.6%), 18.1% had 4 stars, 16.3% had 3 stars, 9.5% had 2 stars, and 7.5% had 1 star.

The data shows that the evaluators identify problems or shortcomings in their culture-related stances with 1/3 of the evaluations being average or below. The total average was 3.89, the standard deviation was 1.308, and the variance was 1.710. These data indicate a high number of positive evaluations and indicate the value that the Culture factor has for the employees of the companies studied. This corroborates Hofstede (2011) since he points out that there are several ways to approach organizational culture. And that there is no perfect model, but its analysis must contain quantitative and qualitative variables that provide validity (Hernández, Méndez and Contreras, 2014).

Career opportunities deal with how the employee perceives the possibility of growth within the organization and their personal development. About 97.6% of the valid evaluations had the career opportunity factor evaluated, of these 29.5% with 5 stars, 25.1% with 4 stars, 20.5% with 3 stars, 13% with 2 stars, and 11.9% with one star. The average score for this factor was 3.47, with a standard deviation of 1.348 and variance of 1.817.

It can be seen that there was a disparity between the evaluations of some companies, where in some this factor was seen as a positive point, with clear opportunities for growth and development, and in others it was already seen as a negative point, where the positions were stagnant and growth opportunities hardly arose. This corroborates Tolfo & Piccinini studies (2001) that ensure that security and confidence in management establish a direct relationship with the evaluation and slips related to career opportunities directly impact confidence.

The **remuneration and benefits** score refers to the employee's satisfaction with their fixed salary, bonuses, profit sharing, and benefits such as food stamps and health plans. For 97.6% of the total valid evaluations collected had observations before the factor, and the majority, 33.5% were rated 4 stars, followed by 3 stars (27.1%), and 5 stars (24.2%). The total mean was 3.62, with a standard deviation of 1.105 and variance of 1.221.

With the majority of evaluations being 4 and 3 stars, it can be seen that the compensation and benefits factor is not the strong point of the companies analyzed, having been cited in a large part of the negative observations of the companies.

The **high leadership** score refers to the employees' perception of people with decision-making power within the organization. These are: high-ranking employees, directors, presidents, owners, among others. Of the 465 available evaluations, only 145 (31.2%) had high leadership ratings, of which 27.6% of the valid ratings were 5 stars, 23.4% were 4 stars, and 20% were 3 stars. Even though the majority of the evaluations had maximum ratings, there was a good balance between the ratings, with the difference between each option being less than 5%. The factor's average score was 3.37, the standard deviation was 1.369, and the variance was 1.874, which shows the lowest average of all the Glassdoor standard questions, but besides the low average, its amplitude is also accentuated, showing that there are people extremely satisfied (supporters) and dissatisfied with the management team's conduct.

With the lowest total average score among all the other factors evaluated, the Top leadership factor can be evaluated as a potential problem for the employees who made the evaluations, possibly having a direct link between the other factors analyzed and may also be a significant variable of influence for the level of organizational climate in companies.

The evaluation regarding **perspective** deals with how the employee's overall view of the company is. The response options were: positive perspective, neutral perspective and negative perspective. There were 145 evaluations about the perspective, out of 465 (31.2%). Of these, 84 (57.9%) with a positive perspective, 35

(24.1%) with a neutral perspective, and 26 (17.9%) with a negative perspective. In view of this evaluation factor, the vast majority of employees had a positive outlook towards the companies.

The **overall score** refers to the employees' perception of the company as a whole. Not necessarily linked to the level of the organizational climate. It can be seen that more than 70% of the companies' evaluations are between 5 stars (41.3%) and 4 stars (29%), indicating a favorable analysis by the respondents. The total average was 3.97, with a standard deviation of 1.099 and a variance of 1.208 (see table 9), indicating a high degree of amplitude in the answers, with maximum and minimum scores. It is worth noting that the overall score is not a simple average of all the scores of the other factors available for evaluation, but only the general perception that the employee had towards the company.

The one-way ANOVA analysis relating the overall score to the individual scores given by the respondents to the items: quality, culture, career opportunity, and compensation/benefits shows that the most correlated score with the company's overall score was clearly the culture score, with 76.0%. Followed by the correlation of compensation/benefits with 74.1%, career opportunity with 66.1% and quality with 58.0%. This result confirms the studies of Bitsani (2013), who asserts that culture represents the most implicit aspects of an organization, containing fundamental values and meanings that are perceived by the members of this organization, highlighting the importance that the care in maintaining a solid culture deserves by managers.

In the test between averages between the general score and culture it is possible to verify the similarity of the averages given by the evaluators. The difference in the amplitude of the answers shows a measure with greater sensitivity on the part of culture in relation to the general score. The objective measure is 74.5% of people, that is, approximately ¾ of the evaluators evaluated the culture and the company itself with the same grade.

6 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

To investigate the perception of climate from the positive and/or negative manifestations on the *Glassdoor* platform, it was necessary to analyze the keywords present in the observations. Observations that contained at least one keyword that could be an influencing factor for the climate were analyzed. Of the 465 available evaluations, 451 (96.7%) met this requirement.

The words that referred to the organizational climate were analyzed under the category "climate". Such as "good relationship among colleagues" and "friendly atmosphere among colleagues", and their similarities were the most present among the observations. These, appeared in 62% of the answers, and 99.3% were among the positive observations.

The terms used by the respondents were: "friendly atmosphere among colleagues", "pleasant climate", and "relaxed atmosphere and ambience". These, lead one to understand that the use of the word "climate" may not be linked to the level of organizational climate, but to the good relationship among employees.

According to Lima (2019), good interpersonal relationships are a positive aspect. For, it optimizes processes, makes the work happier and is one of the factors of influence on the level of organizational climate. Individually, all 5 companies in this study had more than 50% of the answers with positive remarks about the "climate". E3 stands out in this aspect, with 70% of positive remarks. Thus, on a general level, a good interpersonal relationship is perceived among the employees of the companies analyzed.

"Culture" was the second most frequent keyword, present in 126 answers (28.3%). About 75% of these remarks were positive. Terms such as: "great organizational culture," "modern culture," and "friendly culture" were used. Among the 25% of negative observations, the most frequently used terms were: "plastered culture" and "forced culture".

Analyzing the companies individually, it was noticed that E6, E3 and E5 had the highest overall scores. These companies obtained the highest number of observations

with the keywords "climate" and "culture" in the same answer. Luz (2003) states that organizational climate and culture are the main elements of company management, portraying the degree of material and emotional satisfaction of people at work, considerably influencing their performance. The company that stood out the most in this aspect was E6, with 42% of the total observations containing the two keywords in the same answer, which tends to be totally related to the company's overall score, which is the best evaluated among the participants (4.6).

The third key word highlighted is "opportunity". For, it was present in 111 evaluations (24.6%). Of these, 59.5% were positive observations, with terms such as "growth opportunity", "development opportunity", and "career opportunity". Among the negative observations, the highlight was the company E4, with 39 answers (43.3%) with terms such as "lack of career opportunity" and "little opportunity for growth".

Another key word worth mentioning is "management," being seen in 20% of the responses. Unlike "climate," "culture," and "opportunity," "management" was more present in negative observations (83%), where respondents used terms such as "unprepared management," "failed people management," and "family management" to criticize the way in which the companies evaluated are managed. Other terms used that can identify a dissatisfaction of the respondents with their superiors are "unprepared leadership", "lack of appreciation" and "lack of criteria for promotion", present in 9% of the total observations, with the company E7 standing out negatively, with 40% of the evaluations with observations about "lack of criteria for promotion, and the company E5, with 14% of its evaluations having observations about "unprepared leadership".

Thus, it is understood that the way the company is managed, the way the employee perceives that their leaders are prepared, and how they feel valued has a direct connection with the organizational climate. Lima (2019), states that leaders and managers are responsible for much of the satisfaction of their subordinates and greatly influence the climate of their departments. Crozati (1998) complements that managers should identify critical points, having elements to improve specific

management processes, instituting possible changes, in such a way that they contribute to the improvement of the work environment.

"Remuneration" is another key word often mentioned in the companies' evaluations. Present in 97 evaluations (21.5%), the term was mentioned negatively 77 times (79.4%), and only in E5 there were 42 negative responses, which indicates that remuneration is a problem perceived by employees who evaluated this company. For Lacombe (2012) one of the facts that most demotivates a professional is to consider himself wronged in his remuneration, because it affects not only the material level, but also the psychological well-being of people. According to Rodrigues & Reinert Jr. (2020) the motivational factor is implicit in the organizational climate, which makes the remuneration a possible factor of influence on the climate level.

At the organizational level, to relate the Organizational Culture to the Organizational Climate of the organizations and fulfill objective D of this study, key words were established in the sample according to item 4.3 of the methodology. These associate positive and negative factors that link the evaluators' observations with the organizations' climate perspective, so that despite Glassdoor objectively evaluating only culture, this form of analysis was built to link the evaluated organizations' climate perspective.

Thus it is possible to state that, "climate", "friendly" and "culture" were the words that stood out the most. Such a finding makes it clear that good interpersonal relations and company culture are the factors that positively affect the perception of respondents, also having a direct relationship with the overall average scores of the companies.

The companies with the highest overall scores, E6, E3 and E5, were also those that obtained the highest number of observations with the words "climate" and "culture" present in the same answer.

Regarding the negative words, the words "lack", "low" and "failure", "growth", "remuneration", "opportunity", "unprepared" and "management" can be

highlighted. In the observations, the word "lack" was commonly related to the words "opportunity" and "growth". This shows the dissatisfaction with the lack of recognition and growth opportunities in the companies. The word "low" was usually linked to the word "compensation", and the words "failure" and "unprepared" were usually linked to the word "management". This indicates that several respondents were dissatisfied with the salary offered by the companies, as well as with the way in which they are managed.

Chart 3 – Comparative Table

Company		E6	E7	E5	E4	E3
Size Number of employees Glassdoor		201-500	201-500	201-500	201-500	201-500
Time on Glassdoor (years)		5	6	5	10	6
Evaluations		75	67	98	91	199
Available Evaluations		72	64	90	90	149
Recommend to a friend		96%	82%	88%	64%	93%
Overall Rating on Glassdoor		4,6	3,7	4,1	3,3	4,1
Empresa Engajada no Glassdoor		Yes	Not	Yes	Not	Yes
Presence of positive remarks	**Yes**	100%	75%	86%	90%	96%
	Not	0%	25%	14%	10%	4%
Presence of negative remarks	**Yes**	43%	75%	70%	83%	60%
	Not	57%	25%	30%	17%	40%
Quality Score		4,75	3,66	3,70	3,42	4,01
Culture Note		4,85	3,05	3,83	2,97	4,08
Note career opportunity		4,31	3,09	3,28	2,38	3,63
Note compensation/benefits		4,07	3,63	3,00	3,17	3,80
High score leadership		3,97	2,93	3,50	2,42	3,52
Perspective	**Positive**	61%	63%	57%	27%	65%
	Neutral	29%	26%	23%	23%	26%
	Negative	10%	11%	20%	50%	9%

Source: survey data

To understand the reasons for the evaluations, a comparison chart was developed among the companies that were part of this study. As can be seen in Chart 3.

The first question analyzed was the number of employees, data that is not precise, but helped in the selection process of the companies and allows for comparison, since Glassdoor has a wide range of company sizes. All companies are in the same range, from 201 to 500 employees.

Another aspect analyzed is the time the company has been on Glassdoor and the number of ratings on the platform. The company that has been on Glassdoor the longest is E4, with 10 years on the platform. The other 4 companies have been on the platform for a similar length of time, between 5 and 6 years. As for the number of ratings, E4 has only 91, a considerably small number if compared to the time the company has been on the platform. E5, for example, has a similar number of evaluations (90), but it has been on the platform for less than 5 years and is the youngest of the companies analyzed. The company that stands out the most in the number of reviews is E3, with 199 total reviews, and of these, 149 are available for viewing.

The engagement of companies with the Glassdoor platform proved to be a determining factor for good ratings. Among the engaged companies (E6, E5 and E3), all had an overall score higher than 4 stars, with E6 standing out, with an average overall score of 4.6. The companies without engagement (E7 and E4) had lower scores, which leads us to believe that the fact of being engaged or not with the platform, posting content, answering reviews, may influence the evaluation of employees.

Another factor analyzed was the presence of positive and negative remarks. The company that stood out the most in this aspect was E6, the only one with 100% of the answers with at least one positive observation about factors that may influence the climate. E4 was the company most negatively evaluated by the evaluators.

The perspective was another factor analyzed. The company with the most positive outlook was E3, with 65% positive outlook, followed by E7, 63%, and E6, 61%. The negative highlight was the company E4, where only ¼ of the evaluators

visualize a positive perspective, and the other respondents evaluated the company with a mostly negative or neutral perspective.

The relationship between culture and organizational climate is evident in the positive and negative scores and responses. The company with the highest score on culture (E6 - 4.85), is also the company in which had the highest proportion of positive observations about climate (100%), and lowest of negative observations (43%). The data supports Bitsani's (2013) thesis. According to him, culture and climate are related by the influence of the core values built into the organizational culture in determining the attitudes and practices perceived in the organizational climate.

The negative highlight in this aspect was in the evaluations of the E4 company, which had 83% of responses with at least one negative observation to factors influencing the climate, which was validated by the average score of the culture factor (2.97%), the lowest among the companies that were part of this study.

7 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

We conclude that it is possible to evaluate a company's organizational climate through an open *crowdsource* tool such as *Glassdoor*. Similarly, the organizational culture of a company can be analyzed with qualitative and quantitative methods in a complementary way. This corroborates the interconnection between culture and climate proposed by Bitsani (2013) in two aspects. First, in overlapping the components of the expressive and communicative dimension of organizations, and second, in establishing the relationship of influence that one has on the other.

When evaluating the organizational culture from the observations obtained in *Glassdoor* that it was possible to realize that, the scores of the factor "culture", demonstrate a positive perception of the companies studied. This factor is determinant for the evaluation of the company in which you work or worked.

The relationship between the "Culture" and the "Overall Score" of the companies presupposes a strong relationship between the two factors. This was analyzed quantitatively and, its correlation was estimated at 74.5%. This represents a high significance. This leads us to believe that the "culture" factor is important in the perception of the respondents when evaluating whether the company is a good place to work or not.

The perception of "climate" from the manifestations was apprehended in a qualitative way. The answers showed that good interpersonal relationships are an important factor to define a good organizational climate. Likewise, two negative factors stood out in the perception of climate: the way the company is managed, and the perception about the valorization of work and the individual.

Companies with good marks regarding their culture also presented positive observations in relation to the organizational climate. This relationship was also observed in cases where the culture was not well evaluated, because the observations regarding the climate were also negative. This observation allows us to establish a relationship between the two. This confirms the studies of Luz (2003) and Ouellette (2020). For, for both authors, culture is the cause and climate the consequence of its results in the organizational environment.

In relation to the theoretical contributions, it is considered that the study brings light to the possibilities of studies regarding culture and climate by using the internet and the open *crowdsource* tool as reliable ways to understand an organization, since the volume of information and the diversity tends to bring perspectives, which may be of the organizations, sectorial, territorial, or transnational analyses evaluating different perspectives associated with local management criteria. Bearing in mind that climate and culture analysis have always been carried out within organizations. And, therefore, they have not always been reliable due to workers' fear of losing their positions.

Regarding practical contributions, possibilities are created in two directions: for the company and for future employees. Companies can analyze culture and climate using crowdsource tools to understand how the organizational environment is and

propose corrective measures with more agility. Another point to be considered is the possibility to evaluate the impact of specific management actions and their repercussions that may not be captured by internal evaluations. In addition, the tools allow the construction of strategies to maintain the company's attractiveness to external customers and satisfaction to internal customers. Actions in this sense, consequently, reduce personnel turnover and bad evaluations from former employees, but also enhance crowdsourced employer branding.

Regarding employees, they can understand the culture and climate without asking to speak personally with the people who work in an organization and without having to go through the work experience, allowing them the right to choose in advance to know if they are willing to dedicate their time and their career and associate them with the company they are seeking information from. And especially for those in the organization to have the power to contribute to the tool anonymously without harming their career.

It is believed that the study is limited to the context of large and medium-sized organizations. For, small companies hardly have enough contributions to analyze climate and culture through crowdsource tool. Therefore, regarding future research, it is suggested to analyze companies from different sectors that can be compared with on-site studies of climate and culture in organizations. These studies can be compared and become complementary in the construction of strategies that improve the organizations. Possibilities may also be proposed that aim to evaluate companies with few employees through the use of an open tool of *crowdsourced employer branding*.

REFERENCES

Aparicio, Manuela, Costa, Carlos J. & Braga, Andrew Simoes. (2012). Proposing a system to support crowdsourcing. OSDOC '12: *Proceedings of the Workshop on Open Source and Design of Communication:* p. 13-17 https://doi.org/10.1145/2316936.2316940

Bergamini, Cecilia W., Coda, Roberto. (2006). *Psychodynamics of organizational life: motivation and leadership*. São Paulo: Atlas.

Bispo, Carlos Alberto Ferreira. (2006). A new model of organizational climate survey. *Produção.* vol.16, n.2, pp.258-273. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-65132006000200007

Bitsani, Eugenia. (2013). Theoretical Approaches to Organizational Culture and Organizational Climate: Examples of Exploratory Research and Best Policies in Health Services. *Journal of Human Resource Management.* Vol. 1, No. 4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jhrm.20130104.11

Bittencourt, L. C. & Moraes Filho, R. M. de. (2014). *Mass Collaboration (Crowdsourcing) in corporate communication*. On-line Library of Communication Sciences. Retrieved from: <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/bittencourt-filho-colaboracao-em-massa-crowdsourcing.pdfConsultado on November 2, 2019>

Brabham, Daren. (2008). Crowdsourcing as a Model for Problem Solving: An Introduction and Cases. Convergence: *The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies.* Volume: 14 issue: 1, page(s): 75-90. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856507084420

Crozatti, Jaime. (1998). Modelo de gestão e cultura organizacional: conceitos e interações. Caderno de Estudos. Epub 05, n. 18, pp. 01-20. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-92511998000200004

Curvo L. D. & Heinzmann L. M. (2017). Study of the organizations climate of the people management secretariat of a federal university. Revista Eletrônica Científica do CRA-PR. V. 4, n. 2, 1-18.

Dabirian, A., Kietzmann , J & Diba, H. (2017).A great place to work!? Understanding crowdsourced employer branding. *Bus. Horiz.* vol. 60, issue 2, 197-205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2016.11.005

Estellés-Arolas, E., & González-Ladrón-de-Guevara, F. (2012). Clasificación de iniciativas de crowdsourcing basada en tareas. *Profesional De La Información*, *21*(3), 283-291. https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2012.may.09

Flores, Rafael (2016). *The influence of organizational climate on companies and people.* Available at: https://administradores.com.br/artigos/a-influencia-do-clima-organizacional-nas-empresas-e-nas-pessoas.

Glassdor. (2021). Glassdoor Workplace Trends 2021 Retrieved from: https://www.glassdoor.com/research/app/uploads/sites/2/2020/11/Workplace_Trends_2021_Glassdoor_Final.pdf

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 2. Retrieved from: http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol2/iss1/8

Iglesias Armenteros, Annia Lourdes, Torres Esperón, Julia Maricela, & Mora Pérez, Yuliett. (2020). Organizational climate studies: integrative review. *MediSur*, *18*(6), 1189-1197. Epub 02 de diciembre de 2020. Recuperado en 05 de julio de 2021, de http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1727-897X2020000601189&lng=es&tlng=en.

Landers, Richard N.; Brusso, Robert C.; and Auer, Elena M. (2019) "Crowdsourcing Job Satisfaction Data: Examining the Construct Validity of Glassdoor.com Ratings," *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*: Vol. 5: Iss. 3, Article 6. DOI: https://doi.org/10.25035/pad.2019.03.006

Lima, Higor. (2019). *Organizational Climate - What it is, How to Improve, Examples and Research.* Endomarketing.com. Retrieved from: https://endomarketing.tv/climaorganizacional/lima

Luz, Ricardo Silveira. (2003). Organizational climate management: Proposals of criteria for a methodology of diagnosis, measurement, and improvement. Case study in national and international organizations located in the city of Rio de Janeiro. 182p. *Dissertation* (Master in Management Systems). Universidade Federal Fluminense, Rio de Janeiro.

Ouellette, R.R., Goodman, A.C., Martinez-Pedraza, F. *et al.* (2020). A Systematic Review of Organizational and Workforce Interventions to Improve the Culture and Climate of Youth-Service Settings. *Adm Policy Ment Health* **47,** 764–778 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-020-01037-y

Poncio, Rafael José. (2017). The organizational climate and its main aspects. Retrieved from: https://administradores.com.br/artigos/o-clima-organizacional-e-os-seus-principais-aspectos.

Punina, Álvaro Patricio Carrillo. (2016). Medición de la cultura organizacional. *Administrative Sciences* (8). Retrieved from: https://revistas.unlp.edu.ar/CADM/article/view/2637

Rizzatti, Gerson. (2002). Categories of organizational climate analysis in Brazilian federal universities. 305p. *Thesis* (Doctorate in Production Engineering). Department of Production and Systems Engineering, Federal University of Santa Catarina. Florianópolis.

Robbins, Stephen P. (2005). *Organizational Behavior*, 11 Ed. São Paulo. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/36795902/Robbins_Stephen_P_Comportamento_Organizacional_11a_Ed_S%C3%A3o_Paulo_Pearson_Prentice_Hall_2005_1_

Rocha, C. S. & Pelogio, E. A. (2014). Relation between organizational culture and climate: an empirical study on a federal educational institute campus. *Holos*, Year 30, Vol. 5, p. 292-310. https//doi.org/10.15628/holos.2014.977

Rodrigues, Juliana & Reinert Jr., Adival José. (2020). Organizational Climate: The importance of motivation for the success and prosperity of organizations. *Revista Científica Multidisciplinar Núcleo do Conhecimento.* Year 05, Ed. 03, Vol. 11, pp. 91-113. Retrieved from: <https://www.nucleodoconhecimento.com.br/administracao/motivacao-para-o-sucesso>

Saini, G.K. and Jawahar, I.M. (2019), "The influence of employer rankings, employment experience, and employee characteristics on employer branding as an employer of choice", *Career Development International*, Vol. 24 No. 7, pp. 636-657. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2018-0290

Sbragia, R. (1983). Um estudo empírico sobre o clima organizacional em instituições de pesquisa. *Revista De Administração*, *18*(2), 30-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/rausp.v18i2.166939

Schein, E. H. (1989). *Organizational culture and leadership*, 2. ed. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass. 1989. Retrieved from: https://ape.unesp.br/eulg/pdf/SCHEIN.pdf

Siqueira, Mirlene Maria Matias. (2008). *Organizational behavior measures:* diagnostic and management tools. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2008.

Suen, Hung-Yue, Kuo-En Hung, and Fan-Hsun Tseng. (2020). "Employer Ratings through Crowdsourcing on Social Media: An Examination of U.S. Fortune 500 Companies" *Sustainability* 12, no. 16: 6308. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166308

Tolfo, Suzana da Rosa & Piccinini, Valmíria Carolina. (2001). The best companies to work for in Brazil and quality of life at work: disjunctions between theory and practice. *Rev. adm. contemp.,* Curitiba, v. 5, n. 1, p. 165-193, https://doi.org/10.1590/S1415-65552001000100010

Authors

1 – Daniel Penz
Institution: Faculty CESUSC
Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil
Master in Business at the University of Vale do Itajaí
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6379-8262
E-mail: penz.daniel@gmail.com

2 – Mathias Picollo de Almeida
Institution: Faculty CESUSC
Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil
Degree in Business Administration from the Faculty CESUSC
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0346-3364
E-mail: picollomathias@gmail.com

3 – Bianca Costa Amorim
Institution: Foundation CERTI
Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil
Master in Business Administration from the University of Vale do Itajaí
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5689-1541
E-mail: bianca.costa.amorim@gmail.com

4 – Priscila Cembranel
Institution: Constestation University, Educational Society of Santa Catarina
Mafra, Santa Catarina, Brazil; Jaraguá do Sul, Santa Catarina, Brazil
PhD in Business and Tourism from the University of Vale do Itajaí
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9560-686X
E-mail: priscila_cembranel@yahoo.com.br

5 – Carlos Roberto de Rolt
Institution: State University of Santa Catarina
Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil
PhD in Production Engineering from the Federal University of the State of Santa Catarina
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1722-0101
E-mail: carlos.rolt@udesc.br

Contribution of authors

Contribution	[Author 1]	[Author 2]	[Author 3]	[Author 4]	[Author 5]
1. Definition of research problem	√	√	√	√	√
2. Development of hypotheses or research questions (empirical studies)	√	√	√	√	√
3. Development of theoretical propositions (theoretical work)	√	√			
4. Theoretical foundation / Literature review	√	√	√	√	√
5. Definition of methodological procedures	√	√			√
6. Data collection	√	√	√	√	√
7. Statistical analysis	√	√	√	√	√
8. Analysis and interpretation of data	√	√	√	√	
9. Critical revision of the manuscript	√	√			√
10. Manuscript writing	√	√	√	√	√

Conflict of Interest
The authors have stated that there is no conflict of interest.

Plagiarism Check
The ReA/UFSM maintains the practice of submitting all documents approved for publication to the plagiarism check, using specific tools, e.g.: Turnitin.