

An Approach to Communication Models in Portuguese Public and Private Organizations

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:- It is a fact that globalization has come to intercept our daily lives and affect society through chain reaction phenomena. These changes affect the way we analyze public and private organizations and their communication. Our goal is to address the past and present of the two types of institutions in our country, to understand whether and how the standards of procedure in public and private organizations have points of contact and which domains, strategies and techniques they have used in the information society.

Keywords:- Corporate Communication, Communication Models, Portuguese private and public organizations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern business environment and organizations are influenced by the Fourth Industrial Revolution. As Zdenko et alii wrote:

Industry 4.0 is the conceptual era where the Internet and digital technology becomes an enabler for innovation and transformation (Wahyu Wasono Mihardjo et al., 2018). The exponential speed of developments; disruption across all major industries; and the impact on entire systems of production, management, and governance are what differentiate these developments from previous “industrial revolutions.” However, while all these developments will bring many benefits, they also carry risks. (2019, p. 391)

These changes affect the way we analyze organizations. For Kunsch (1984), and concerning the types of organizations, there are several ways to classify: according to size, turnover, purpose, scope (national or international), types of activities, forms of ownership (public, private and non-profit), etc. Naturally, the concepts presented for the conceptualization of organization can be applied to any type of structure, be it public or private. The most significant difference will refer to the basic objectives that each one proposes. We will study organizations according to their form of ownership, focusing our study on public and private organizations.

Concerning the former, they mean the set of institutions that make up public services - which may be public or, if privatized, made up of mostly public capital - and therefore subject to so-called public management, as well as the bodies subject to supervision and dependence on the state. Thus, and as Tavares (2008) rightly points out, “the activity of public management will be of an

administrative, financial and patrimonial nature, which may or may not include the exercise of authority powers and may be carried out by legal persons public or private law ”; in the second case, the ultimate objective will be to maximize its value for owners, achieved through the production or distribution of goods or services that aim to satisfy the needs of their consumers. In any case, the ultimate goal of both will always be the satisfaction of needs or the defence of interests of a group of people or society in general (Marrucho, sd.).

It is a fact that globalization has come to intercept our daily lives and affect society through chain reaction phenomena. “Globalization influences both our daily life and the events that occur on a world scale” (Giddens, 2000: 16), and this phenomenon is also responsible for the standardization of business management processes; around the world, public or private organizations need to implement good governance processes, be accountable to their stakeholders and disseminate information (Moreira, 2007). As Grunig & Hunt (1984: 296) argue, “beginning in about 1975, public issues management became one of the key phrases in public relations circles.”

Contextualizing the emergence in Portugal of the Information Society, Monteiro (sd) observes: “In the 1980s, in Portugal, we started to become familiar with new terms such as “Information Society”, “computerization”, “information highway”, etc., a whole new terminology from Japan in the 1960s and received in the West in the late 1970s.” Authors such as Bell, Mumford, Naisbitt, Toffler or Touraine launched new ideas about the society ahead, in classic works such as “The Coming of the Post-Industrial Society”, “Technique et Civilization”, “Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming our Lives”, “Clash of the Future” or “The Post-Industrial Society”, respectively.

The possibilities promised by information technologies increased exponentially in the 1990s. Gradually, large organizations were approaching international standards. Banking, insurance, telecommunications or large-scale distribution are examples of areas of activity where the impact of technologies was first felt. Likewise, the dissemination of the Internet and its potential for communication and interaction between societies, businesses and states convinced in the first phase an entire university, business or young audience. Civil society, as a customer of the different sectors, begins to experiment and is aware of the “new ways” of being in society. Later, but still, in a remarkable effort, the public sector showed an

attempt to follow, as far as possible, the European path of the Information Society (idem); of the second gloss of the 90s is the “Green Book for the Information Society in Portugal” (1997) and the National Initiative for Electronic Commerce (1998), which are very demonstrative of the work done by the Portuguese State in this regard.

In this way, and Monteiro's words (idem), around 2000, the initiatives were different: in governmental terms, efforts to identify initiatives and the processes of communication, action and implementation of them, at a national level, became more intense and urgent; in business terms, large companies continue with their action plans (framed by international benchmarks) and the ICT market continues to stimulate and support the different innovation fronts.

II. CORPORATE COMMUNICATION IN PORTUGAL

Today, after the first decades of the millennium have passed, the country is another concerning information technologies. The relationship with the digital world is enormous and felt across society. Technology intertwines our daily lives about interaction with institutions (public and private), electronic commerce, the expansion of knowledge sources and skills acquisition tools, the emergence and implementation of civic projects, the sharing of experiences... and we are at the top of the European rankings regarding the availability of public services online (European Commission, Directorate General For Information Society and Media, sd).

Obviously, the daily advances in terms of the performances and possibilities of technological artefacts demonstrate that there is an enormous space for growth for the Information and Knowledge Society. As an illustration, the Knowledge Agency and the Technological Plan put in perspective the path that has already taken place and the long road that we have, in parallel, ahead of us.

Cruz (s.d.) addresses the issue of change in organizations with the observation “We all face the evidence that, as a result of the national and international situation, Portuguese organizations are changing. Or forced to change.” Because it is necessary to increase the level of competitiveness, the old management models - autocratic, paternalistic and centralizing - are being replaced by new, democratic and decentralized models, resulting from benchmarking, the importation of concepts or the consequence of Certification processes. The author states that observing the principles that guide the management systems, it appears that some of the vectors recognized as essential in the change process are related to communication in organizations. As we saw earlier, the survival of organizations is therefore imperative to continuous change, the permanent effort to adapt and adjust to the market.

2. Specificities of the Communication Models in the two Systems

We saw how the main goal in the life of organizations should be an orientation towards the market/citizen. Public institutions are no exception, like the citizen, as the recipient of the services they provide, deserves continuous improvement work that leads to the improvement of the services provided and, consequently, the level of satisfaction.

Quality requires a new management culture that involves people in the process of improving the services provided - both the internal customer (translated into the other departments of the organization and employees in general) and the external customer (people or organizations that acquire or receive the final product, such as, for example, the citizen) (Carapeto & Fonseca, 2005). Given the importance of the latter in the organization's activity, it must anticipate its expectations and, in the pursuit of excellence, it must, in addition to meeting its expectations, offer them more than it expects.

Marketing tells us (Lendrevie [et al], 2010, 1990) that one of the first tasks of any organization is to identify and segment its customers, according to the different services it provides and their needs and expectations. Cumulatively, you should seek to know your opinions, which are essential to define priorities, set the course and improve the organization's services. For this, it is necessary to collect information about your needs and expectations, which can be done through different techniques. The most commonly used are of a quantitative type (surveys, questionnaires distributed in the service centres...). These instruments make it possible to know first-hand the needs, priorities or degree of satisfaction with the services by the citizen-customers, as well as suggestions for improving the processes. However, for more in-depth knowledge of the citizen, public bodies should use tools of a more quantitative type, such as focus groups, which allow another level of analysis. From here, decision making and communication with citizens are facilitated. Naturally, and in this specific context, information technologies cannot be underestimated, as they streamlined communication, provided new platforms for the exchange of ideas, for the intervention of citizens in public life, for collaborative innovation... (Marques (preface), in Fonseca and Carapeto, 2009).

In summary, what is important to keep in mind, regardless of the methodology used, is that the assessment of citizen-customer satisfaction has as main objective the perception of the distance that separates their expectations and the level of service that they perceive as having received. This information is indispensable so that those responsible can find the best work methodologies, to balance the needs and expectations of the organization's client-citizens. By encouraging citizen participation in the construction and assessment of quality parameters, the organization is encouraging social control over its activity. That is why it is so important to periodically evaluate their performance about the established quality standards, using mechanisms such as mystery users, making complaints boxes available at service points, questionnaires to users and maintaining a database of suggestions and comments.

It is in this sense that the study of internal and external processes is important, through the identification, management, evaluation and continuous improvement of all activities, contributing and providing added value to the company. An organization that can perform these exercises truly works as an open system, that moves and decides to take into account the market, working according to profit (Teixeira, 2010 [1998]). Even though in the case of companies the need for marketing is evident since they need to identify the products or services most suitable for the target markets they intend to reach and develop actions that enable the successful commercialization of these goods, marketing it is therefore not an activity that develops exclusively in for-profit companies. The same is to say that marketing also applies to other types of organizations, since, in one way or another, any organization only justifies its existence in society if it exchanges with the outside goods that society, in whole or in part, values, so public organizations also need to be open systems (Pires, 2008).

The difference concerning public organizations is that as Rocha (2001: 184) observes, “the decision-making process in private companies enjoys much more flexibility”, besides that, as Sousa (2009 [1990]) reinforces, the company it is an economic agent that is autonomous, and therefore endowed with independence, which is not the case with each of the state organizations. Even so, in the last few years, it has been verified in some public organizations the importation of typically business management practices and processes, introducing autonomy and flexibility (in its organizational, personal and financial dimensions) and implementing a set of techniques such as marketing or public relations. For Gouveia (apud Penteado, 1993: 87), “public relations vary from institution to institution, from one situation to another, from one circumstance to another. And they also vary in time and space (...), from an easy and prosperous economy to one in depression, from Public Administration to private administration”. This position is shared by Lozano (2001: 197) when he affirms: “public relations must be as important for Public Administration as the backbone is for every living being that wants to walk and win. (...) Public organizations have to serve society and to do so with enthusiasm, professionalism and speed, using all the means and resources necessary to provide an effective service to the country”. In the same vein, Fonseca (1998: 47) considers that the clients of the Public Administration are the set of users of their services and that this, “by definition, should correspond entirely, with quality and promptness, to what is required”.

Consequently, communication is a duty imposed on public powers and services, to make citizens' right to information and public debate effective. Likewise, public communication itself is at the basis of the quality and effectiveness of public service, the modernization of administrations and institutions, as well as the exercise of democracy.

Public communication began to be conceptualized in the early 1980s, in France, and as systematized by Barros & Bernardes (s.d.), at first it sought to level itself with the parameters of private initiative, using marketing techniques such as advertising. However, this specific area of communication needs different approaches. Respecting the recipient of the message is an essential element in democracy. The relationship and dialogue with the citizen are essential expressions of public communication, and equality presupposes respect for individuality, promoting diversity. Public communication is not just publicity and visibility in the media, but effectively the relationship with the citizen. Communication must be a component of public policy” (Lemaire and Zémor, 2008).

Transparency and democratic participation are pointed out by Zémor (2005 [1995]) as pillars of public communication, prerequisites for the full functioning of this system, insofar as they guarantee the common interest. This emphasis is justified by the nature of public information services, whose domain must go beyond the sphere of the State or the specific institution that produces the content. As this is a highly visible communication, the citizen's view is more relevant than the control of the State. It is in this assumption that Zémor's argument that ensuring the general interest necessarily implies transparency (Barros & Bernardes, s.d.) is supported.

Thus - and based on this assumption - listening to the public's requests, expectations and inquiries must be primary functions of public communication, in the same measure of stimulating and strengthening public debate, a requirement to foster civic participation. Systematizing the main functions of public communication, Lemaire and Zémor (2008) highlight:

- adequately inform the public, which implies bringing comprehensive and contextualized news to the population, in addition to rendering accounts about the services provided by the institution;
- to contribute to ensure and strengthen social relations (feeling of belonging to the collective, making the citizen aware as a social and political actor);
- to monitor the behavioural and social changes at each historical moment;
- nurture civic knowledge.

Public sector communication, therefore, supposes exchanging with a receiver that is, increasingly, also emitting, and it is the latter's active characteristic that establishes communication. In the view of Zémor (2005-1995), the mission of public communication is not limited to informing a passive public, but also bringing public institutions closer to society. Therefore, public communication comprises a set of external communication activities that bring together public journalism, institutional dissemination and institutional advertising, in an increasingly closer and unmediated dialogue with its audiences.

Libois (2002) also certifies the right to public communication as a basic requirement for the consolidation of citizenship rights. In his view, and today, the formation of personal and cultural identities and political communities is inseparable from media communication, in a context of visible weakening of the State in the face of the power of the media and highlights that, in parallel, media systems seem increasingly disconnected the opinion of its audiences.

In the relationship between public communication and citizenship, Libois highlights a series of mistakes. One of them is to conceive the former instrumentally only, since its ultimate aim is, in reality, to provide conditions for the exercise of citizenship. Therefore, there must be harmony between the public sector and its publics, in a context in which the latter should be remembered as “a set of duly organized individuals, equipped with sufficient information on a given subject, in a permanent discussion on the same, in search of a common agreement” (Corrêa, 1998: 42). Another mistake already pointed out by Zémor and reinforced by Libois, is the transposition of parameters from the private to the public communication systems. This idea is also defended by Ferry, in the preface to a work by Libois (2002: 5-8). For the former, by imitating private techniques, public communication repeats and perpetuates the bad habits of the market, harmful to citizenship. Moreover, it disseminates to the citizen the idea that the standard of communication is the one achieved by private organizations, which for this reason must be copied. And in this way, employees of public communication systems deprive citizens of differentiated information on the themes, a plurality of approaches and a deeper understanding of the themes.

In short, public communication is one that highlights the public interest, not only by providing information but above all by responding to citizens' requests. As Zémor (1995) recalls, messages are sent, received and handled by public institutions on behalf of citizens; therefore “this communication is necessarily located in the public space, under the eyes of the citizen. Your information, with rare exceptions, is in the public domain, as ensuring the general interest implies transparency” (Zémor, (2005, 1995: 1).

For all the reasons presented above, Matos (2009) and Brandão (apud Barros and Bernardes, s.d.) also recognize the difficulty in conceptualizing the term “public communication”. In a text summarizing the emergence of the concept, the latter identifies five different areas of knowledge and professional activity involved:

- organizational communication, that is, the flow of information and opinions between organizations and their audiences. In this logic, “public communication is treated in a strategic and planned manner, and aims not only to establish relations with the different publics of the institution, but also to create an institutional identity, or, to put it another way, an “image” of the company” (Garrido, nd);

- scientific communication, especially scientific dissemination;
- governmental communication, constituted by the rendering of accounts of the government and formation of the public agenda;
- political communication, which means the expression of political opinions by political parties and actors;
- and community communication, as a way of ensuring the right to information and communication.

Brandão summarizes the different formulations in an attempt to synthesize public communication as “a communicative process that is established between the State, the government and society to inform for the construction of citizenship” (2007: 9).

The State apparatus must fully understand the citizens as the clientele of the Public Administration and respond to them promptly and effectively as it happens in private organizations, which, since always dependent on the relationship with the environment that involves them, they need to deal with other priorities that require different structures and action plans. Lemaire and Zémor (2008) affirm that it is imperative to establish a “perennial trust relationship” between public institutions and citizens, listening to them and informing them about what is or is not possible to do in public administration, in an adult dialogue with the population. In the specific case of crisis communication, they point out, what restores confidence is the exact information of what is happening. “When we don't know what to do and how to act, we must recognize this. The crisis does not penalize public communication; marketing is expensive”(idem).

That seen, the authors emphasize the difference between a communication which intends to establish a dialogue, to clarify and serve the public interest, and – on the other side - the dissemination of information for persuasive purposes, aiming to convince citizens about the viability of a proposal or idea.

III. CONCLUSIONS

We thus see that the evolution in the concept of organizational communication has also been influencing the public sector in this sense. To this end, the dissemination of social communication has contributed to a great extent, which has increased exponentially with technological democratization, changing the forms and time of distribution of information, expanding access to it for citizens (Matos, 2000). As a consequence, the public became more aware of their rights and began to demand more often than they are respected. The liberalization of markets, the prosperity that was experienced in Europe at the end of the 20th century, and privatizations in the public sector led to an increase in the supply of services, many of which were previously exclusive to the State. This reality has changed because the behaviour of consumers: they have become more enlightened and consequently more demanding, they have started to compare the offers made available, and, when justified, to defend their interests. These behavioural

changes forced organizations to renew and recycle their communication strategies, intending to improve the quality of services and meeting objectives. Matos (2000) and Tenera (1998) consider that planning techniques based on Total Quality can be useful in this aspect, substantially facilitating the design of the company's communicative action. Strategic planning will allow determining the orientation of the organization's communication plan, clearly defining who the audiences are and their needs, developing products and processes that respond to those needs and transferring the resulting plans to the operational forces (Matos, 2000 : 3). In the scope of internal communication, all these changes would generate greater demand for information on the part of employees, greater participation when requested to do so and, consequently, their co-responsibility concerning the efficiency and image of the institution (Garrido, sd).

In Corrado's opinion (apud Matos, 2000), the collaborators' aspirations when it comes to communication are easily understandable. They intend to know exactly the situation of the organization at each moment, the problems it faces, the ways to solve them and what is the role of each worker in this context. If communication does not answer these doubts, there is room for rumours, so strategic communication planning is vital to fill these gaps and, above all, to aggregate the different organizational levels around common languages, practices and objectives, on the path to creating an organizational identity. This need for a communicative practice for the different segments of audiences in organizations is also addressed by Nogueira (s.d.), who highlights the impact of changes in organizational administrative models, traditionally oriented towards efficiency. Gano (apud Nogueira, s.d. ; 2) says: "We have to look for effectiveness, which is adult and collective, and which requires sharing responsibly, integrating information". The author also proposes that public agencies adopt management practices in their communicative processes. Communicators need to know deeply the organization in which they work; with the support of communication techniques and instruments, it is possible to detect the current management model (which influences the entire organizational culture) and, from there, develop an appropriate communication plan, with a view to behavioural changes and the improvement of relationships among employees - whose participation in decision-making processes has visibly increased. As Viana (apud Garrido, s.d.) reinforces, "When a company makes a communication plan, it is willing to look at itself, the competitors and the context in which it operates. Over time, under the pressure of competitors and the demands of the public, it becomes another company for itself. This is what will determine your renewal or aging."

Since information can significantly change the perception of quality on the part of citizens, public organizations must produce and provide adequate and reliable information to their citizen-customers, using the appropriate channels. Currently, electronic communications are of particular importance. The good use of information and communication technologies by the public organization

must serve not only the computerization of internal processes but also accessibility and transparency for citizens, whenever they need to find information, to dialogue with someone in the organization or to trigger some administrative procedure.

For this to happen, it is essential that the organization has a website and that mechanisms are made available that allow and promote interaction with the citizen (Sousa, 2004). As mentioned in the Guide to Good Practices in Building Web Sites of the State's Direct and Indirect Administration, released by the Innovation and Knowledge Mission Unit (Oliveira, Santos and Amaral, 2003), Internet's power is, alongside publishing content, the ease with which it is possible to establish communication or interaction between people. The Guide recommends that any public organization use the Internet and its website, as an information vehicle, so that citizens can consult content, but also as a tool for interaction between citizens and their services. To this extent, the Guide recommends that several services should exist, included or referenced on the website: newsletter; e-mail; forum; online chat; telephone lines dedicated to supporting users; suggestion and complaint books. In this orientation for the citizen-client that technologies also allow, in a line of modernization (which goes beyond mere computerization), electronic mail plays a fundamental role. The use of electronic mail in the organization can effectively serve two modernization objectives: to make public services more accessible and transparent to citizens; and, consequently, improve its internal functioning. However, it is necessary to understand that its implementation as a privileged means of communication with citizens, requires a complete integration in the administrative functioning of the organization and this can even imply changes in the processes (Carapeto & Fonseca, 2005).

Therefore, internal and external communication is essential in organizations, as Zdenko et alii point out:

Communication considerably influences the innovation process in every organisation. Many other studies have indicated that the heart of numerous problems occurring during innovation processes is in ineffective or unreliable communication, especially between different functional departments of the organisations involved in the process. It is therefore important that organisations emphasize the development of open and quality communication (2019, p. 393).

REFERENCES

- [1]. Barros, A.; Bernardes, C. (2009) *Contribuições Francesas ao debate brasileiro sobre comunicação pública*. [21, january, 2012]: <http://www.intercom.org.br/papers/nacionais/2009/resumos/R4-2890-1.pdf>
- [2]. Cruz, A. (s.d.). *A Mudança nas Organizações Portuguesas*. [03, november, 2010]: <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/cruz-ana-mudanca-organizacoes-portuguesas.pdf>

- [3]. Garrido, B. (s.d.). *Comunicação entre órgãos públicos: limites entre a intenção e a realização*. [23, march, 2012]: <http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/garrido-comunicacao-bocc-05-09.pdf>
- [4]. Garrido, F. (2001). *Comunicación Estratégica*. Barcelona: Gestión 2000.
- [5]. Giddens, A. (2000). *Un mundo desbocado: los efectos de la globalización en nuestras vidas*. Madrid, Santillana.
- [6]. Grunig, J.; Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*. Orlando, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- [7]. Kunsch, M. (org.) (1984). *Comunicação Interpessoal nas Organizações e Fortalecimento da Cidadania*. São Paulo: Summus.
- [8]. Oliveira, J.; Santos, L.; Amaral, L. (2003). *Guia de boas práticas na construção de web sites da Administração Directa e Indirecta do Estado*. Lisboa, Secretariado Executivo da Comissão Interministerial para a Sociedade da Informação.
- [9]. Lemaire, M. & Zémor, P. (2008). *La communication publique en pratiques*. Paris, La Documentation Française.
- [10]. Lendrevie, J.; [et al.] (2010 [1990]). *Mercator – Teoria e Prática do Marketing*. Lisboa, Publicações D. Quixote.
- [11]. Libois, B. (2002). *La communication publique: pour une philosophie politique des medias*. Paris, L'Harmattan.
- [12]. Lozano, F. (2001). *Manual prático de Relações Públicas*. Lisboa, Livros do Brasil.
- [13]. Marque, M. (Prefácio). In Fonseca, F., & Carapeto, C. (2009). *Governança, Inovação e Tecnologias – O Estado Rede e a Administração Pública do Futuro*. Lisboa, Edições Sílabo.
- [14]. Marrucho, D. (s.d.). *Introdução às Organizações*. [27, july, 2012]: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46168290/INTRODUCA-O-AS-ORGANIZACOES>.
- [15]. Matos, H. (2009). *A Comunicação Pública no Brasil e na França: desafios conceituais*. [21, janeiro, 2012]: <http://www.intercom.org.br/papers/nacionais/2009/resumos/R4-3060-1.pdf>
- [16]. Matos, H. (2000). *Comunicação pública e comunicação global*. In Congresso Brasileiro de Ciências da Comunicação, Manaus. [23, march, 2012]: <http://www.portal-rp.com.br/bibliotecavirtual/cidadania/0083.htm>
- [17]. Monteiro, M. (s.d.). *A Sociedade de Informação em Portugal - Uma leitura dos últimos 10 anos. O que fizemos e o que não fizemos... mas podíamos ter feito*. [27, july, 2012]: http://www.apdsi.pt/uploads/news/id546/3.6_helena%20monteiro_070626.pdf
- [18]. Moreira, J. (2007). *Public Health Policy in action – Framework for a new rethoric in persuasión*. Charleston, BookSurge.
- [19]. Moreira, O. [et al.] (2007) *A Comunicação de Informações nas Instituições Públicas e Privadas: o caso XBRL – eXtensible Business Reporting Language no Brasil*. *Revista de Administração Pública*. Fundação Getúlio Vargas. 41 (4), 769-784.
- [20]. Penteado, J. (1993). *Relações Públicas nas Empresas Modernas*. São Paulo, Livraria Pioneira Editora.
- [21]. Pires, A. (2008 [1991]). *Marketing: conceitos, técnicas e problemas de gestão*. Lisboa, Editorial Verbo.
- [22]. Rocha, J. (2001). *Gestão Pública e Modernização Administrativa*. Oeiras, Instituto Nacional de Administração.
- [23]. Stacho, Z., Stachová, K., Papula, J., Papulová, Z., Kohnová, L. (2019) *Effective communication in organisations increases their competitiveness*. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 19 (1), pp. 391-403. DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2019.19.1.30
- [24]. Sousa, A. (2009 [1990]). *Introdução à gestão: uma abordagem sistémica*. Lisboa, Editorial Verbo.
- [25]. Tavares, J. (2008). *A ponderação de interesses na gestão pública vs. gestão privada*. Coimbra: Almedina.
- [26]. Teixeira, S. (2010 [1998]). *Gestão das Organizações*. Lisboa, Verlag Dashofer.
- [27]. Viana, F. (2001) *De cara com a mídia - Comunicação corporativa, relacionamento e cidadania*. São Paulo, Negócio Editora.
- [28]. Wahyu Wasono Mihardjo L., Sasmoko S., Alamsjah F., Elidjen E., 2018, *The Role of Distinctive Organisational Capability in Formulating Co-Creation Strategy and Business Model Innovation*, “Polish Journal of Management Studies”, 18(2).