

# Organizational Management: Public and Private Sector in Portugal - Institutional Dichotomies and Functional Particularities

Ana Matias

Polytechnic Institute of Viseu  
Centre for Studies in Education and Innovation  
Portugal

Luís Cardoso

Polytechnic Institute of Portalegre  
Centre for Comparative Studies – University of Lisbon  
Portugal

**Abstract:- This article intends to map similarities and dissimilarities between the generic models of functioning of public and private organizations. Recently, we have been observing trends, on the part of the Public Administration, in the sense of approaching private institutions and their strategic orientations, in search of greater proximity with citizens. Regarding the differences in terms of organizational standards, it should be noted that in public organizations there is a multiplicity and complexity of objectives, in addition to very different authority relationships from those that exist in private organizations, which results in different institutional dichotomies and functioning.**

**Keywords:-** *Organizational Management, Public Administration, Private Administration.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Today's society is a society of organizations, some very simple in structure, others highly complex. Large or small, with or without profit, people work together to achieve objectives that would be impossible to achieve if individuals working in isolation. Although it is not possible to find a universally accepted definition for the concept of management and, having evolved a lot over the last century, there is some consensus regarding the assumption that it must include a set of tasks, which seek to guarantee the effective allocation of all the resources made available by the organization, to achieve the predetermined objectives.

Thus, and despite the multiplicity of definitions for the term "management", we believe we can define it as "the way to ensure the use of scarce resources of the company/organization, to achieve the previously set objectives" (Teixeira, 2010 [1998]: 10). In other words, it is up to management to optimize the functioning of organizations, through making rational decisions based on the collection and processing of relevant data and information. So, is something like "planning, organizing, leading and controlling in order to achieve results with people" (Kaehler & Grundei, 2018: 7). In this way, it contributes to the development of those and to the satisfaction of the interests of all its internal elements, as well as to satisfy the needs of society in general or of a group in particular.

### ➤ *Private and public organizations*

Intending to map similarities and dissimilarities between the generic models of functioning of public and private organizations, we assume that any public management activity must pursue the satisfaction of public interests, governed by criteria of compliance with the legal order, such as good management - effective and efficient. If your management nature is business, it will be profitable, if your nature is non-business, your purpose will not be that. Private management, as a rule, is free as to the management models to continue its activity. Recently, positions that argue that it is necessary to import the private management model to the public sector are quite frequent, with the justification that it is more agile, flexible and rational. Furthermore, through various signs, society has been showing increasing demands in improving management standards, in compliance with principles of public service ethics and good governance. It is a growing awareness of citizens regarding their right to demand greater transparency, rigour, efficiency and responsibility in the management of public resources. (Tavares, 2008; Gberville, 2017).

In the scope of the public sector, namely, the public business sector, private business management models have long been imported. However, it is admitted that there is a shortage in Portugal of global comparative studies on the public and private sectors.

However, whatever the scope of the State's intervention (greater or lesser), there is no reason why public management is not, as it is already in some cases, an example of good administration (Borins, 2002; Lane, 2000). Under the legal system, public management must, of necessity, be guided by the principles of economy, effectiveness and efficiency. But it is important not to forget that, due to limitations inherent to its nature, in which the pursuit of the public interest must always be present, there are - in comparison with the private sector -, many other special requirements that must be observed, namely concerning respect to procedures, at the financial level, and concerning how collective needs are met.

With society having basic needs for its survival, the State has to provide them. Habermas (1984: 14) states: "The state is the public power. He owes the attribute of being public to his task of promoting the public good, the common good of all citizens. " In the national case, the

State's tasks are reflected in article 9 of the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic.

Known for always distancing itself in the options related to planning and management practices, we have recently been checking trends, on the part of the Public Administration, towards the approach to private institutions and their strategic guidelines, in search of greater proximity with citizens. As these are the clientele (in the sense of the set of users of the services) of the Public Administration, there is an urgent need for the prompt and effective satisfaction of collective needs, through the humanization and simplification of relations with users. Therefore, the State seeks to initiate a policy of administrative modernization in which users are recognized as the position to which they are entitled. Rocha (2001: 9) considers that in the last decades there has been an "import of business management techniques and methods, to make public services efficient", with citizens being given "the status of consumers" (idem, *ibidem*). It turns out that, due to its specific area of activity, the public reality is different from the business world. The author presents a set of differences that range from environmental characteristics to the different relationships between public organizations themselves, and to organizational standards. In his view (idem: 36), "organizations are not as exposed to the market, not having so much pressure to reduce costs and increase efficiency". On the other hand, its performance is subject to legal and regulatory restrictions, with controls of various kinds, in addition to suffering political influences from parties, lobbyists, and even citizens. About relations between public organizations, it should be noted that they imply, on the one hand, power relations and, on the other hand, an impulse to social and political consultation. Concerning differences in terms of organizational standards, it should be noted that in public organizations there is a multiplicity and complexity of objectives, in addition to relations of authority very different from those that exist in private organizations. "Public managers are limited in their role on employees and cannot use incentives and other motivating mechanisms" (idem: *ibidem*) that private individuals frequently resort to. And Borins (2001: 310) reinforces: "The Public Sector is traditionally considered averse to innovation, particularly that initiated by middle management and first-line employees. "... The reward for successful innovations is minimal. (...) The consequences of unsuccessful innovations are serious" (idem: 311).

Cumulatively with the above, public administration reform has centred the problem of its poor efficiency on a supposed excess of employees. This argument, which has justified many programs for changing public administration and has been identified as one of the causes of the latter's dysfunctions, is in reality secondary (Carapeto & Fonseca, 2005). The main issue has to do with the role of the State in today's society and its purposes, insofar as the type and dimension of public administration depends on the functions that are attributed to the State.

In recent years, the role of the nation-state (an emblem of 20th-century political history) has been called into question. This fact will have as its predominant cause - although not the only one - the globalization process, whose main drivers were the globalization of the economy and the development of new information and communication technologies, which allow the establishment of global production and finance networks, as well as an authentic "communication revolution". As we saw above, this last factor contributed to the transition from the industrial society to the knowledge society and led to the alteration of the decisive factors of production in the 20th century, which are information and know-how (Castells, 2000, 2002; Messner, 1999). This new reality triggered, in capitalist societies, profound transformations in the power of the State, in terms of functions, social base, sovereignty, autonomy and political legitimacy (Gómez, 2000).

In this scenario, contemporary states are faced with diverse and complex requirements, which has caused the weakening of institutions and the weakening of their authority. In this context, the main challenge for States is to find ways to reconcile the historic achievements of the democratic State, such as the separation of powers, legality, proportionality, the responsibility of public office holders and judicial control), with the modernization imposed by the so-called "market model", aimed mainly at citizens as customers and the economy.

The classic model of the welfare state, designed to guarantee social well-being, was fertile ground for numerous phenomena of inefficiency, so the state is currently seeking, in a "disintervention" movement, to dispense with most of the tasks that it has traditionally been doing. They were committed and dedicated themselves to a smaller number of tasks, largely embodied in management, control and incentive activities (Estorninho, 2009 [1996]), in what Majone (1997) calls for a paradigm shift between the Interventionist State and the Regulatory State: The decline of the Keynesian, interventionist and redistributive State, gave rise to a new regulatory State, whose main instrument is the manufacture of rules. That is, the State becomes essentially a neutral regulator of market processes, intervening fundamentally for failures in terms of public infrastructure and services, that is, for the same reasons that underlie State intervention in the market economy (Majone, 1997).

In reality, the functioning models of modern society require a conception of the State as a "catalyst-dynamize" (Carapeto & Fonseca, 2005: 20). This means the predominance of financing, promotion and regulation functions, over the traditional functions of production and distribution of goods, and provision of services to the community (Mozzicafreddo, 1992). In the perspective of Rosanvallon (1995), this change means, above all, that the binomial - something simplistic - is going beyond the nationalization versus privatization and the relationships between the State and society are redefined, having one to reinvent and adapt to each particular context. Since about

three decades ago, with the increase in demands for greater transparency and accountability from government officials and popular participation, the changing role of the government has become evident. In this context, power is no longer concentrated in a strong central governmental structure, residing, instead, in a wide range of institutions - central, regional and local -, in groups from the private economic sector, as well as in civil society, with their non-governmental organizations, and citizens themselves (Corkery, 1999). In this dynamic process of exercising power, the boundaries between the public and private sectors tend to blur. The State shares power and acts in partnership with other interlocutors, maintaining its central position only to coordinate the activities of different actors that influence each other (Stoker, 1998), in a hybrid set of flows and networks in which state elements are combined, non-state, national and global (Santos, 1998).

The notion of governance is, therefore, especially linked to the reflection on the most effective and efficient ways of managing society, in an increasingly global and uncertain universe. The exhaustion of traditional forms of public action (hierarchical, centralized, distant from civil society) forced the emergence of forms of action more adapted to the context, in which the State dilutes its presence, abdicating part of its power and acts in partnership with networks of interlocutors, who associate, put their resources, their knowledge, their capacities and their projects in common, sharing responsibilities, in a set of interaction processes shaped, in concrete and each State, by the respective institutional framework and by their culture (Merrien, 1998).

In this perspective, the transition from a guardian state to a partner state (Papadopoulos, 1999), is almost inevitable, since the more transversal and collective nature of public problems makes it impossible to use the State's imposing power. This is led to request the agreement of the people and to negotiate the implementation of measures, to reduce as much resistance as possible. Social change, therefore, forced the State to become more receptive, and obliged to respond to the concrete needs expressed by citizens. Therefore, the basic orientation of public organizations should increasingly be for the citizen (Jorgensen, 1993). In a modern state, public administration cannot see citizens only as voters and contributors; rather, they consider them active citizens, with rights and obligations (Liegl, 1999), who are given the possibility to intervene in the process of formulating policies through their consultation (Bilhim, (2009 [1996])), so that they can take part in the production process as co-producers or decide what should be produced. Currently, it is not enough for the public administration to provide information on their performance (efficiency) or indications on the achievement of formal objectives (effectiveness), as these do not necessarily guarantee to obtain the desired results. Hence the need for interaction between the public administration and citizens, which goes beyond the exchange of information; the State then has the role of moderator among the diverse interests of participating organizations, groups and citizens.

In short, we can affirm that there is a change in the theoretical field of public management: from pure approaches to greater vigour in the defending currents of democratic citizenship. Liegl (1999) maintains that it is now accepted that citizens can contribute to a more receptive public administration, which can be achieved by combining civic rights of participation with the “new public management” model so that citizens can intervene throughout the process. the implementation process of each public policy. As A. Mendes (s.d.) reinforces, OECD countries adopt the terminology of “new public management” and recommend to all member countries that they apply their fundamental principles. According to Hood (1991), these principles are The privatization of services, with a reduction in the weight of the State; The adoption of business management methods; Debureaucratization and decentralization, supported by a model that emphasizes results, service, participation and open systems. The main characteristics of the new public management are thus based on the use of private-sector methods, with the introduction of competition factors in Public Administration, the emphasis on economic rationality, and the appreciation of the results obtained.

However, and at this juncture in which the public sector is faced with financial constraints, reduced staff, new public needs and the emergence of serious social problems, it is bound to improve its performance. The challenge is to develop a proactive attitude, anticipate citizens' demands and promote continuous improvement in their management, adapting and optimizing structures and working methods. Aware of these challenges, the European public sector - although in some cases with undeniable delay concerning the private sector - has been working in search of quality and excellence, in a lengthy process that requires, above all, a solid leadership and diplomacy in the management of organizations that are, for the most part, “anguished by dysfunctions of decades, namely the excess of formalism, the impersonality of internal and external relations, the centralization of decision-making, the excessive departmentalization, the slowness of communications and the weak sharing of information, the overvaluation of procedures and disinterest in the needs of citizens. (Carapeto and Fonseca, 2005: 28).

In our country, public administration reforms have to be analyzed in light of the recent consolidation of the rule of law. An autocratic political leadership of almost fifty years marked society and public administration: the decision was concentrated at the organizational top, the employees were only executors and were limited to obey, and the citizens passively accepted everything that came from the State (OECD, 2001d ). However, since 1974, Portuguese society has changed more than in any other period of its history, and more than many other European countries in the same period (Barreto, 2000). This happens, essentially, for two reasons: the profound political change that took place that year (and that enabled the adoption of a democratic regime), and the accession to the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1986 (OECD, 2001). Barreto (2000) details that it was in the last few decades

that elementary civic and political rights (vote, expression, meeting, association, demonstration ...) were established and the concept of "rights" was extended, which also became part of political prerogatives, social and cultural). The undisputed authority of the State was diluted, and the consultation and participation of citizens gradually gained ground in Portuguese society. The establishment of democracy brought about the growth of mechanisms and organizations for the defence of rights and representation. Hamman and Manuel (1999) add that voluntary associations and organizations were formed, and the foundations of organized civil society (although still weak) were emerging under the protection of the new democratic regime.

In this context, in the last twenty years the Portuguese public administration has undergone profound changes, sometimes in a very accelerated way, sustained in a posture of innovation and administrative modernization based on experimentation and focused on rethinking the administration's mission, modifying structural models, introducing mechanisms of the market, and involve society in the process of change. Portugal, therefore, embraced "citizen orientation" as the heart of its administrative change (Corte-Real, 1999; OECD, 2001). Some examples of the closer relations between the administration and the citizens in Portugal are mechanisms such as the Complaints Book, the Citizen's Shop (one of the most successful examples in the search for the quality of public services), the Corporate Formalities Centers and the Citizen Portal.

Risk aversion makes change extremely difficult, as well as lack of definition and/or lack of communication of strategic objectives and priorities, bureaucratic procedures, lack of a culture of accountability, outdated organizational structures, disarticulation between services/bodies, lack of a rewarding culture for merit, politicization/partisanship of leading bodies or positions and the lack of a customer service culture (Deloitte, 2006).

However, the increased application of innovation awards reveals that, despite the inappropriate context, first-rate employees and middle managers are responsible for many innovations, and some public sector organizations have consistently produced a high number of innovations (Borins, 2001; Stern, 2007).

The public sector has, as Lozano (2001: 197) advances, "the primary duty and mission of perfecting itself in every way for the effectiveness of its service to society and informing its users truthfully and punctually of all their actions, projects and achievements". However, what is certain is that in Portugal there are public organizations that, despite their state being the majority shareholder, operate in a truly competitive market, which, moreover, was the reason for their privatization. The same is true in sectors such as banking (Caixa Geral de Depósitos) or the oil sector (Galp), in which the market is not only competitive but highly competitive. Despite their predominantly public character, these organizations introduced the concept of the market in their management,

adopting a "market paradigm" (Rocha, 2001: 181) to the detriment of the "bureaucratic paradigm" (idem: *ibidem*) that characterized them. Consequently, this culture and market orientation led to the appearance and adoption of marketing strategies applied to some public services. Even organizations that do not have the ultimate goal of profit and therefore do not struggle to sell their products need to do marketing. Kotler (2000: 13) advances that, in these cases, there is someone "who wants to attract a response or a resource from another entity, be it attention, interest (...), or a sympathetic criticism". This vision sees the citizen as a priority, the centre of public service concerns, that is, the quality of the service provided consists of meeting their explicit and implicit needs. Organizations thus acquire contours that transform them into social agents of relative autonomy, at the service of the society they integrate. In summary, even though they are subject to clearly defined objectives, we can say that public organizations are not linked to a purely business mission, as they are not strictly animated by profit. Its purpose is essential of service to the citizen: even so, regardless of the philosophy that is inherent to them, all organizations strive to achieve effectiveness and efficiency.

With globalization and information and knowledge societies, States need to reorient their role, becoming increasingly dynamic and catalyzing agents and less and fewer producers and distributors. The growing complexity of today's societies also requires the State to have a regulatory role that guarantees economic growth and social equity. According to the document of the Technological Plan Coordination Unit, "Public Administration; Working Document No. 15" (sd), a modern and effective State should be able to adapt to the demands of a knowledge-based society, playing a role fundamental in three areas: Ensuring access to quality services for all citizens, namely in areas such as health, education, social services, security, justice, or infrastructure, regardless of whether the provision is public or private; Economic regulation, namely at the level competition policies, fiscal policy, labour market, etc. The State must have a regulatory action that stimulates growth and economic development, and that creates the necessary conditions for a more competitive economy and that promotes social well-being; of the economy, by promoting the creation, use and dissemination of knowledge, by stimulating the production of innovative products and services, towards a competitive and knowledge-based society, where the State assumes a catalytic and dynamic role.

In this reformulation of the role of the State, there are inevitably issues that need a great political debate and deepening, namely the selection/classification of services and goods that must have a public nature, the provision model (who produces and provides), who should enjoy the services. public goods (safeguarding universality), or whoever evaluates the provision of the public good.

Information and communication technologies are fundamental to the reform of public bodies, contributing to greater proximity and a better relationship between citizens

and the State. On the other hand, they can provide state agencies with the necessary tools to achieve greater efficiency and rationalization. However, the profitability of ICT must always be accompanied by the optimization of processes, reorganization of services, evolution of attitudes and rationalization of resources (Inova - Engenharia de Sistemas, s.d.; Koch & Hauknes, 2005). Effectively, public organizations are formed to fulfil the commitments assumed with society, making these commitments part of the objective that characterized the organization's formation; public organizations are essential instruments of government action. However, they are not regulated by market laws, but by organic laws that, on the one hand, help them (guaranteeing their survival) and, on the other hand, hinder their dynamic evolution, directly interfering in their decision-making process, mainly because coexistence of the law with administrative theory has been very difficult, due to the rigidity and immobility of that in the face of the challenges of change faced by our society. (Pereira, apud Decker, s.d.).

In fact, and traditionally, there is a preference in this sector for the almost unconditional compliance with rules of a bureaucratic nature and the search for efficiency, to the detriment of guidelines focused on effectiveness. However, recently, there has been some effort on the part of the tutelage to modernize and reduce bureaucracy in Public Administration, embodied in the attempt to apply traditional business techniques, such as, for example, management by objectives or quality management (Matias-Pereira, 2007).

In turn, private organizations are simultaneously social, cultural and political phenomena. Social and cultural agents, because they increasingly assume themselves as the space for the realization and training of citizens, who spend a large part of their time within the institutions to which, for various reasons, they belong; political agents, insofar as, in the face of the crisis of the protective state and the discredit of political ideologies, the responsibilities of the private sector grow (Silva, 1997). These organizations, therefore, appear as one of the social, cultural, economic and political pillars of the modern Western world. In fact, of all the existing organizations, companies are the most important and with the greatest repercussions in the whole of society, as they are organisms composed of several people to develop an activity together, seeking to achieve their goals.

It is precisely due to these objectives that the concept of business management has applicability, whose main task is, as advocated by Teixeira (2010 [1998]): 3), “to interpret the proposed objectives and transform them into business action, through initiatives of planning, organization, direction and control”. Therefore, companies exist to achieve their objectives, among which profit and survival itself stand out. In this regard, Sousa (2009 [1990]) considers that, for private organizations, the ultimate goal is the optimization of long-term profit. To this end, they formulate and implement their strategies, which contain plans (tactical or operational) that help to define guidelines

in line with the environment in which the organization operates. It should be noted that, to achieve the objectives, resources must always be used efficiently, producing goods and services that best satisfy the needs of consumers (Teixeira, 2010 [1998]). Hence it follows that, for private organizations, concepts such as competitiveness, efficiency, profitability or dynamism represent pillars from which all their way of being in the market is built. It is important to note that private organizations value concepts such as people management, “so that all their potential is released and applied to continuous improvement” (Rocha, 2001: 118), or as a strategy, which involves development and implementation of a vision with values, objectives, plans and actions that reflect the organization's optimized management, capable of promoting total quality. Consequently, the private sector promotes effective and efficient management of human, financial, IT and technological resources, not least because with this it manages to satisfy the needs and expectations of customers (its ultimate purpose) and employees (valuing human capital). The guiding norms of private bodies thus take into account the achievement of the objectives defined through careful management of financial resources and as a goal the satisfaction of the needs and expectations of the market in which they operate.

## II. CONCLUSION

In summary, when we refer to innovation within the organizational structures emerging at the beginning of this century, we argue that innovation should deserve priority attention in the public sector, as it helps these services to improve performance, to adapt to the expectations of citizens, to increase efficiency and effectiveness, and to minimize costs. Innovation - that is, the new ideas that work (Carapeto & Fonseca, 2005, 381) - can take many forms: discrete innovations, of existing processes or services, through the use of new technologies, for example - are called as “incremental”, not changing the way organizations are structured and work; innovations that translate into new services or new ways of providing them are “radical” innovations, which, despite positively affecting performance, do not alter the global dynamics of the sector; and more extensive innovations, which transform sectors, give rise to new labour relations, new organizational structures and structural changes in performance, are “systemic or transformational” innovations, which require major changes in organizational, structural and cultural arrangements. This last category results from technological advances and substantial changes in mentalities or new policies (Carapeto and Fonseca, 2005). For a public organization to improve its performance in a lasting way, the attention given to the processes through which innovation flows is decisive.

The essence of innovation is creativity, which allows you to find new collections for existing problems. It is a personality characteristic in some individuals, but it is enhanced by leadership incentives and a work environment conducive to their development. This is because, as Mintzberg, Quinn and Goshal (1995) argue, innovative

organizations do not depend only on an entrepreneur, but on teams of experts gathered to create an entrepreneurial spirit. For this reason, it is necessary to use scientific techniques to promote creativity, as well as encourage and reward people and organizations that innovate, through the recognition of successful practices (Performance and Innovation Unit, 2001).

An innovative organization brings together many more attributes than being merely operational: it is flexible, not formal, it fosters the creation of new knowledge, it provides for the creation of teams for the development of projects, and some officials act as liaisons in coordination places functional and design.

In the public sector, some effort is being put in order to overcome some barriers to innovation: lack of competition and incentives, aversion to risk and ritualized compliance with procedures, short-term planning and budget, failure of leadership, lack of measurement, legislative limitations, resistance to change by employees (Taylor, 2018). But “Public sector production innovations, however, are relevant and can take a variety of forms – changes in management structures, changes in physical production processes, and changes in delivery systems. In recent years much emphasis has been placed on digitization (that is, eGovernment), throughout the public sector particularly with respect to record keeping, making information available to the public, and “customer” service (for example, voting, voter registration, paying taxes, and issuing licenses).”(Leyden, 2017).

In short, and about the differences between Public Administration and the private sector, Koch says:

Yes, we have concluded that there are important differences between much of the innovation that occurs in public institutions and that of the private sector. However, it should be noted that innovation is a matter of using learning, that is, using skills as a basis for finding new ways of doing things, improving the quality and efficiency of the services provided. (2005, p.1)

## REFERENCES

- [1]. BARRETO, A. (2000). Portugal e a Europa: quatro décadas. In *A situação social em Portugal, 1960-1999*. Lisboa, Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa.
- [2]. BILHIM, J. (2009 [1996]). *Teoria Organizacional – Estruturas e Pessoas*. Lisboa, Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas.
- [3]. BORINS, S. (2002). Leadership and innovation in the public sector. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. Emerald. 23 (8), 467-476.
- [4]. CARAPETO, C.; FONSECA, F. (2005). *Administração Pública – Modernização, Qualidade e Inovação*. Lisboa, Edições Silabo.
- [5]. CASTELLS, M. (2000). A era da informação: economia, sociedade e cultura. In: *A Sociedade em rede*. São Paulo, Paz e Terra.
- [6]. CASTELLS, M. (2002). *A Sociedade em Rede: A Era da Informação, Economia, Sociedade e Cultura (Vol. I)*. Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- [7]. CORKERY, J. (1999). *Rapport introductif*. In *Gouvernance: concepts et applications*. Bruxelles, IISA.
- [8]. CORTE-REAL, I. (1999). *Modernization de l'administration au Portugal*. In *Les administrations en mouvement: les réformes de modernisation administrative dans 4 pays: Portugal, Pays-Bas, Irlande et France*. Maastricht, Institut Européen d'Administration Publique.
- [9]. DECKER, C.; MICHEL, M. (s.d.). *A imagem nas organizações públicas: Uma questão de política, poder, cultura e comunicação – Estudo de caso INSS em Pelotas*. Acedido em 18, junho, 2015, em: <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/decker-cleiton-michel-margaret-imagem-nas-organizacoes.pdf>
- [10]. DELOITTE (2006). Relatório “*A Mudança na Administração Pública*”. Lisboa, 3º Congresso da Administração Pública. Deloitte & Associados.
- [11]. ESTORNINHO, M. (2009 [1996]). *A fuga para o Direito Privado: Contributo para o estudo da actividade de Direito Privado da Administração Pública*. Coimbra, Almedina.
- [12]. GBEREVBIE, D. (2017). *Public Administration – a conceptual perspective*. Ibadan, Cardinal Publishers.
- [13]. GÓMEZ, J. (2000). *Política e democracia em tempos de globalização*. Petrópolis, Editora Vozes.
- [14]. HABERMAS, J. (1984). *Mudança Estrutural da Esfera Pública*. Rio de Janeiro, Tempo Brasileiro.
- [15]. HAMMAN, K. & MANUEL, P. (1999). Regime changes and civil society in twentieth-century Portugal. *South European Society & Politics*, Vol. 4, 1, 71-96.
- [16]. HOOD, C. (1991) A Public Management for All Seasons?. *Public Administration*. Vol. 69, 3-19.
- [17]. INOVA Engenharia de Sistemas (s.d.). *Administração Pública no século XXI*. Acedido em 21, janeiro, 2012, em: <http://www.modernizacao-administrativa.pt/newsletter/5/MA5/DT15.html>
- [18]. JORGENSEN, I. (1993). Modes of governance and administrative change. In KOOIMAN, J. (ed.). *Modern Governance: New Government - Society Interaction*. London, Thousand Oaks.
- [19]. KAEHLER, B. & GRUNDEI, J. (2018). *HR Governance – A Theoretical introduction*. Cham, Springer.
- [20]. KOCH, P.; HAUKNES, J. (2005). *On innovation in the public sector – today and beyond*. Oslo, Nifu Step.
- [21]. KOTLER, P. (2000). *Marketing para o século XXI*. Lisboa, Editorial Presença.
- [22]. LANE, J.-E. (2000). *The Public Sector - Concepts, Models and Approaches*. London, SAGE.
- [23]. LEYDEN, D. (2017). Innovation in the Public Sector. In *Innovation in the Public Sector – Country experiences and Policy Recommendations*. New York and Geneva, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

- [24]. LIEGL, B. (1999). The fallacies of new public management - can they still be prevented in the Australian context?. In ROUBAN, L. (ed.). *Citizens and the new governance: beyond new public management*. Amsterdam, los Press.
- [25]. LOZANO, F. (2001). *Manual prático de Relações Públicas*. Lisboa, Livros do Brasil.
- [26]. MAJONE, G. (1997). From the positive to the regulatory state: causes and consequences of changes in the mode of governance. *Journal of Public Policies*, 17, 139-167.
- [27]. MATIAS-PEREIRA, J. (2007). *Manual de Gestão Pública Contemporânea*. São Paulo, Atlas.
- [28]. MENDES, A. (s.d.). Subsídios para uma Teoria das Crises Políticas. Acedido em 27, julho, 2015, em: <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/mendes-antonio-subsidios-teoria-crisis-politicas.pdf>
- [29]. MERRIEN, F. (1998). De la gouvernance et des États-providence contemporains. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Sociales*. 155, 61-71.
- [30]. MESSNER, D. (1999). La transformación del estado y la política en el proceso de globalización. *Nueva Sociedad*, 163, 71-91.
- [31]. MOZZICAFREDDO, J. (1992). O Estado-Providência em Portugal: estratégias contraditórias. *Sociologia - problemas e práticas*. 12, 57-89.
- [32]. OCDE (2001). *Government-Citizen relations. Country profile: Portugal*. Acedido em 12, julho, 2015, em: <http://www.oecd.org/gov/publicsectorinnovationand-government/2538004.pdf>
- [33]. PAPADOPOULOS, Y. (1999). Gouvernance, coordination et légitimité dans les politiques publiques. *EUI-RSCAS Working Papers 99/00*, European University Institute (EUI), Robert Schuman Centre of Advanced Studies (RSCAS).
- [34]. ROCHA, J. (2001). *Gestão Pública e Modernização Administrativa*. Oeiras, Instituto Nacional de Administração.
- [35]. PERFORMANCE AND INNOVATION UNIT – PIU (2001). *Strengthening leadership in the public sector. A research study by the PIU*. Acedido em 21, março, 2011, em: [www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/upload/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/piu-leadership.pdf](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/upload/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/piu-leadership.pdf)
- [36]. ROSANVALLON, P. (1995). *La crisis del Estado Providencia*. Madrid, Editorial Civitas.
- [37]. Stern, DILENSCHNEIDER, R. (2000). *The corporate communications bible*. Beverly Hills, New Millennium Press.
- [38]. SOUSA, A. (2009 [1990]). *Introdução à gestão: uma abordagem sistémica*. Lisboa, Editorial Verbo.
- [39]. STOKER, G. (1998). Cinq propositions pour une théorie de la gouvernance. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Sociales*. 155, 19-29.
- [40]. TAVARES, J. (2008). *A ponderação de interesses na gestão pública vs. gestão privada*. Coimbra, Almedina.
- [41]. TAYLOR, S. (2018). Innovation in the public sector: dimensions, processes, barriers, and developing a fostering framework. *International Journal of Research Science and Management*. Vl. 5, 28-37.
- [42]. TEIXEIRA, S. (2010 [1998]). *Gestão das Organizações*. Lisboa, Verlag Dashofer.