


SOCIAL MANAGEMENT: the potential contribution of a Brazilian research tradition to the international nonprofit debate

GESTÃO SOCIAL: a contribuição potencial de uma tradição de pesquisa brasileira para o debate internacional sobre Terceiro Setor

GESTIÓN SOCIAL: la contribución potencial de una tradición investigadora brasileña al debate internacional sobre el Tercer Sector


Helga Midori Iwamoto

Post-doctorate in Regional Development by the Federal University of Tocantins (UFT). Adjunct Professor IV at the Federal University of Tocantins (UFT). helga@uft.edu.br.

 0000-0002-6527-7137

Airton Cardoso Cançado

PhD in Administration from Federal University of Lavras (UFLA). He is currently a professor and Deputy Coordinator of the Postgraduate Program in Regional Development, Coordinator of the Professional Master in Public Policy Management and professor of the UFT Administration Course. airtoncardoso@uft.edu.br.

 0000-0003-4698-1804

Mailing address: Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT), Avenida NS-15, Quadra 109, Norte, s/n - Plano Diretor Norte, 77001-090 - Palmas, TO – Brazil.

Received: 04.03.2020.

Accepted: 05.27.2020.

Published: 07.01.2020.

ABSTRACT:

The paper presents the convergences and divergences of Nonprofit Organizations (NPO) theory and Social Management. Then, it present the possibilities of development of Social Management in the NPO. At the end of the paper, the main contributions of Brazilian Social Management theory to the international nonprofit debate are summarized and leave open some guidelines to future researchers that may want to follow this research stream..

KEYWORDS: Brazilian Social Management. Nonprofit Organizations. Third Sector.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to present and discuss a research tradition known as Social Management, a field that has been consistently developed by Brazilian scholars during the last 25 years, making it useful to the international nonprofit debate. In this work, several concepts of NPO are presented and compared with the discussion about Social Management.

Social Management focuses on the process of participation in the Public Sphere. In order to be fully appreciated, participation should lead to collective decision-making, without coercion, with transparency and inter-subjectivity as assumptions and the 'dialogicity' as a generative mechanism (Cançado, Tenório & Pereira, 2011).

Three main concepts help to build the foundations of Social Management: Public Sphere, Well Understood Self-Interest (Tocqueville, 1835/2003) and EmancipatioFirst, the dynamics of Social Management within the Public Sphere is based on a Negative Dialectic Relationship, as proposed by Theodor Adorno, composed of Thesis and Antithesis without Synthesis, because Synthesis is not possible due to the inherent

incompleteness of the whole, according to the author (Cançado, Pereira & Tenório, 2015). Second, the concept of Well Understood Self-Interest was inspired by the work of Tocqueville and can be summarized as the interdependence between individual and collective interests (Tocqueville, 2003). The individual interest only is fully achieved and sustainable if the collective interest is too. Thirdly, Emancipation means getting rid of an other's tutelage and think for oneself (Lukes, 2001).

In a negative dialectic relationship (Adorno, 1973), the more the interest is well understood, that is, there is interest in the common good, the broadest are the possibilities to extend the Emancipation and vice-versa.

In the other hand, NPOs have many important works, for example: Salamon and Anheier (1992), Salamon (2010), Salamon and Sokolowski (2016) and Frumkin and Andre-Clark (2000).

In the next section, the theoretical foundations of Social Management are presented. It follows with an overview of the academic works developed around Social Management and its currents developments.

Social Management research tradition: evolution and theoretical roots

The positioning of Social Management as an academic field is not without controversies. While some authors place Social Management within the broad Management field (Cançado, 2011), other authors characterize it as intrinsically multidisciplinary (Araújo, 2012). On the other hand, Social Management seems to be closer to the so-called field of Public Studies, which is constituted by the interweaving of law, Business Management, Economics and Social Sciences and it is configured as a multi loci or interdisciplinary scholarly field that would include Social Management, Public Management and Public Policies (Pires, Silva, Fonseca, Vendramini & Coelho, 2014).

The origins of the term Social Management can be traced to Tenório (1998, 2010). The author found the expression in a text of Rovida (1985) which deals with self-management experiences in the Spanish Civil War. In Rovida's vision (1998), Social Management was applied with the meaning of proletarian democracy of local character. Tenório (1998) elaborates saying that Social Management contrasts to Strategic Management to the extent that it tries to replace the techno-bureaucratic, mono-logical management, for a more participatory, dialogical management, in which decision-making is exercised by means of different social subjects.

Tenório's (1998) position is grounded in the Frankfurtian Critical Theory, especially in Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action. Another important reference is the work of the Brazilian sociologist Guerreiro Ramos, particularly his critique of the organizational studies' status quo and the hegemony of utilitarian rationality (Tenório, 1997).

In the vision of Tenório (2005), Social Management can be defined as a dialogical management process in which the decision-making authority is shared among the participants of the action (action that may occur in any social system - public, private or non-governmental organizations). The 'social' adjective describing the noun 'management' will be understood as the privileged space of social relations in which everyone has the right to speak, without any coercion. Going further, Tenório (2010) argues that the boundaries of Social Management as a new concept intended to emphasize that the drive of managers' actions should be society and not the market. This perspective follows not only the Frankfurt critical thinking as a *santoamarian* critical thinking (Ramos, 1981), reaffirming that the market is just one of the enclaves of society.

Fischer (2002) describes Social Management – or Social Development Management – as a transformative mediation process. For the author, the Social Manager should be responsible for mediating the Social Development Processes. This mediation is transformative toward coordinating processes of complex nature, using efficiency and efficacy combined with participation and transparency, through actions and collective learning. Another important concept proposed by Fischer (2002) is inter-organization, i. e., a group of distinct and integrated organizations that are connected by common purposes. The association is due to complementary reasons (Fischer, 2002).

Next, Carrion (2007) presents the perspective of good governance where the State must create and encourage the possibilities for the participation of society, making the inclusion of citizens possible in the Public Decision-Making. The author gets closer to Fischer (2002), when presenting the conflict as inherent in Social Management, and to Tenório (1998), when he addresses the differences between Social Management and Strategic Management. Carrion (2007) also warns that Social Management is not a synonym of a transposition of principles and Business Management postulates for the social field, so that when a private organization performs an action of Social Responsibility, transposing principles of Business Management to manage its social project, it is not practicing Social Management.

The Social Management perspective should also be understood as a pre-paradigmatic perspective in construction (Kuhn, 2012). To França Filho (2008), Social Management as an end seeks the management of the social demands and needs, getting closer to Public Administration. As a process, it moves away from Public Management, because when trying to subordinate instrumental logic to other more social, political, cultural or environmental logic, it moves away from the bureaucratic-instrumental logic, which is a characteristic of Public Management.

Cançado, Tenório and Pereira (2011, p. 697) presents Social Management as the collective decision-making, without coercion, based on the intelligibility of language, dialogicity and clear understanding as a process with transparency as preconditions and Emancipation as an ultimate goal.

Social Management theoretical roots

Several authors have been working in the creation of a conceptual map that gives meaning to Social Management (Fischer, 2002). This theoretical effort includes the concern of França Filho (2008), who describes the need for more consistent theoretical and methodological frameworks, under the risk of trivializing Social Management terminology.

Cançado (2011) presents a theoretical approach supported by the construction of categories and theoretical sub-categories that delineate Social Management. This initial work was refined in subsequent writings (Cançado, 2013b; Cançado, Pereira & Tenório, 2015).

The proposed theoretical approach is based on three major theoretical categories: Well Understood Self-Interest, Public Sphere and Emancipation. According to the authors, the categories should be interpreted as Weberian Ideal Types, because one cannot achieve them concretely. They are a guide, an abstract situation to be achieved that is constantly rebuilt by a Negative Dialectic Relationship (Adorno, 1973). The Adornian Negative Dialectics is based on the thesis and antithesis with no synthesis (or without false syntheses, as the author prefers). This theoretical approach can be considered as a dynamic situation, where the ultimate goal is to continuously improve the dialogical relationship as a process in the Public Sphere.

Well Understood Self-Interest

Well Understood Self-Interest is an adapted concept from Tocqueville (2003), who uses it for describing the American society in the nineteenth century. The author starts with the contrast between Aristocracy (characterized by natural inequality and hierarchy) and democracy (characterized by equality without hierarchy). Well Understood Self-Interest can only happen in a democratic context. The participation in the Public Sphere is what defines the political nature of democratic government and not the popular content of its action or external forms of its institutions (Jasmin, 2005).

Well Understood Self-Interest starts from the premise that the collective well-being is a precondition for individual well-being. Therefore, when defending collective interests, the individual is ultimately defending its own interests (Tocqueville, 2003).

What it might seem, at first, an utopia or at least an exaggerated optimism, can also be seen as a different way to relate public and private interests. Gahyva (2006) argues that the Well Understood Self-Interest would impel citizens to the public arena, because the “Tocqueville bet” implied the possibility of founding a social solidarity starting from the exercise of enlightened self-interest of democratic individuals. Complementing, Marx and Engels (1969) argue that the free development of each individual is the condition for the development of the whole community.

The concept of Well Understood Self-Interest reinforces the matter of interdependence between individuals in order to perceive the dynamics of their own role in the Public Sphere, not in the sense of being altruistic or even welfarist, but in a sense of collective (re)construction of the Public Sphere with the clear intention to achieve the collective well-being and consequently the individual well-being. There are in fact occasions where individuals perceive that they depend on each other, removing that egocentric and independence sentiment that leads to confuse freedom with private self-sufficiency (Barbacena, 2009).

Public Sphere

The concept of Public Sphere dates back to the Greeks and Romans. While in Greece man takes place in the Public Sphere, after his “victory” in the Private Sphere with his freeing of home affairs and qualifying for the Public Sphere, in Rome the Public Sphere is as important as the Private Sphere, namely, the family life. It is noteworthy that, in both spheres, few had access to the Public Sphere, because only men considered citizens had access to this realm (Habermas, 1991; Arendt, 2013).

With the downfall of the Roman Empire and the subsequent advent of absolutism permeated by Christianity, new players came into play. Thus, the Public Sphere, *stricto*

sensu, had no longer the importance of before. In that context, the king dominated both his nation and the private life of his citizens, his will being the law. In that context, there was no room for the Public Sphere. Allied to that, the Christian society had a non-political and non-public nature, because its members should relate as brothers of the same family. The Church presents religion as a substitute for citizenship (Arendt, 2013).

With the rise of the Mass Society, the Social Sphere reached its peak and began to control all members of particular communities, destroying the private domain as well as the public domain, depriving men not only of their place in the world, but also of their private homes (Arendt, 2013). Before that, like in Greece and Rome, the public domain was the place where people had room to express their individuality (Arendt, 2013).

The great improvement of human work capacity, played in the Public Sphere, was followed by an actual loss in speech ability, banished to the intimate Private Sphere. As one can see, in the Mass Society the behavior and not the action dominates the individual's life, because he does not clearly perceive the possibility of a Public Sphere that can defend his interests. Consequently, he does so in the sphere left to him, the Private Sphere. This degenerates in a large scale to individualism (Arendt, 2013).

With the development of the press and what Habermas (1991) called the literary Public Sphere, ideas became published and discussed in cafés and saloons in Europe. The intellectualism became valued for being perceived as a mean of understanding among people. Habermas (1991) affirmed that this bourgeois Public Sphere can be understood initially as the sphere of private people gathered in public. Its social premise is an economic market that, tendentially free, makes the exchanges in the sphere of social reproduction, as far as possible, a private matter among private people to each other, thus completing finally the privatization of bourgeois society (Habermas, 1991). With the development of the bourgeois Public Sphere and, due to the Public Sector enmeshment with the Private Sector, creating an intermediate sector or re-politicized Social Sphere, such a model became useless because the intermediation is no longer necessary between State and society by means of the Private Sector (Habermas, 1991).

In the case of Social Management, it is aimed to achieve a new Public Sphere that can approximate the population to politics. This way, one can say that Social Management seeks an expanded Public Sphere, wider than the bourgeois Public Sphere. For Social Management to effectively happen, a public space is necessary, where once again (but with different intentions), private individuals meet to decide on

their needs and future. This time, the notion of individuals involves everyone interested, not just those participating in the bourgeois Public Sphere.

According to the theoretical approach proposed, it must be presented now, in more details, the redefinition of this Public Sphere. It starts with the concept of public.

According to Habermas (1991), public events are defined by being accessible to everyone. Similarly, Arendt (2013) refers to the public as two similar phenomena, but not completely identical: (1) everything that happens in public that can be seen and heard by all with broad dissemination; (2) common space to all people. These public settings have in common the importance attributed to the act of speaking, be heard and understood by others out of the Private Sphere of home.

For Habermas (1991), just as the world of life taken as a whole, the Public Sphere is reproduced through Communicative ActioThe Public Sphere intertwines with the Private Sphere both in the dense networks of family interaction and circle of friends and in the most superficial contacts with neighbors, co-workers, acquaintances, etc. (Habermas, 1991). The new proposed Public Sphere has the dialogue and intersubjectivity in its core. What is sought is that the individual is recognized as such in a negative dialectic relationship between Well Understood Self-Interest and Emancipation.

Emancipation

The concept of Emancipation is inspired by ideas as the positive and negative freedom in which each individual is either self-determining or left free from interference by others (Dworkin, 1999). The Emancipation as a theoretical category of Social Management is developed according to Marxist tradition (Marx, 1978; Marx & Engels, 1969; Santos, 2010) and to critical theory (Horkheimer, 1976; Marcuse, 2007, 2009; Paes-De-Paula, 2008; Sgró, 2007). Perhaps the preface of 1969, from the book *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1969/1972), authorizes us to say that the work of the Frankfurtians can be understood as an energetic and decisive call to think about what to do to unite theory with practice, to achieve reconciliation of man with nature and the operational with emancipatory rationality (Sgró, 2007).

On one hand, it starts from the consideration that the Utilitarian Reason (Ramos, 1981), hegemonic in the Western capitalist world, is a barrier for Emancipation (Ramos, 1981; Marx & Engels, 1969; Sgró, 2007; Tragtenberg, 2005).

On the other hand, the idea that all social behavior is conceived as a strategic behavior, being able to be explained as the result of an egocentric calculation of

possible advantages, is not realistic (Habermas, 1996). This phenomenon of oversimplification is described by Marcuse (2007), in which a pattern of one-dimensional thought and behavior emerges, in which ideas, aspirations and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced in terms of this universe. Still according to him, all liberation depends on the consciousness of servitude and the emergence of this consciousness is always hampered by the predominance of needs and satisfactions which, to a great extent, have become part of the individual.

According to Paes-De-Paula (2008), liberation may not occur individually, because in the vision of Marx and Engels (1969), the union and solidarity are conditions to collective Emancipation. Other prerequisite for the collective Emancipation is the individual Emancipation (Marx, 1978). Anyway, Emancipation does not come from only from the outside; it must be also constructed individually by each person (Marx & Engels, 1969; Marx, 1978; Habermas, 1996). The individual is emancipated when sees himself as an individual with individual potentialities (*forces propres*), as an engine of social forces, in sum, when he perceives himself as a political being. It happens only when the individual reabsorbs the abstract citizen in himself (Marx, 1978).

This paper's theoretical approach suggest that Emancipation lends itself to enhance the perception of the Well Understood Self-Interest and vice versa.

To complement the understanding of the proposed theoretical approach, one might think by counter-induction (Feyerabend, 1970). To prevent Social Management from happening it is only necessary that one of his component theoretical categories is deficient to the point that it prevents the others. If there is little awareness of Well Understood Self-Interest or if the Emancipation is not present, there is little use for a new Public Sphere, because people will be unable to be satisfactorily part of it. On the other hand, if the space of the new Public Sphere is not available, it must first be (re)built and only then be experienced. The key to the theoretical approach is the notion of balance and interdependence between theoretical categories (Adornian Negative Dialectics), as well as its character of Weberian Ideal Type. As a limitation, it can be said that it is still lacking their first paradigm (Kuhn, 1978) or consolidation of a scientific research program (Lakatos, 1976).

Research Agenda

Cançado, Pereira and Tenório (2015) and Cançado, Rigo and Pinheiro (2016) presented a research agenda based on the main debates in the research field of Social Management in Brazil. The agenda has four topics.

The first, Inter-organizations and Community of Practices, is related to the possibilities of deliberative spaces of participation being used for the development of Social Management. These spaces are formed by organizations that are complemented by their differences (Inter-organizations) and by people who interrelate in those spaces (communities of practice). Communities of practice are spaces where people live and have interest in learning and teaching at the same time, through their relationships, in a context of collective decision-making (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

The second point is directly related to the debate between Cançado (2011) and Araújo (2012), complemented by Cançado (2013a). The debate refers to the issue of the Social Management paradigm (Kuhn, 1979). The question to which the agenda refers is as follows: is Social Management going to build a paradigm in the sense of Kuhn (1979) or will it be understood as a multi-paradigmatic field?

The next topic of research agenda is related to the framework used to identify Social Management in deliberative organizations (Tenório, 2012). This framework, called Deliberative Citizenship Criteria, has been in use in Brazil ever since. It allows comparing different collective decision-making spaces and allows the analysis of these spaces, showing where the discussion needs to move forward. The framework is based on the following categories: Process of Discussion, Inclusion, Pluralism, Participatory Equality, Autonomy and Common Good.

The last topic refers to the scope of Social Management: Would Social Management be confined to small geographic spaces or limited by the number of people participating in the process? In other hand, could Social Management have greater reach, mediated by Information and Communication Technologies - ICTs? These questions are connected to the type of participation (direct or representative) that is expected in the context of Social Management. In the case of this text, Social Management happens through direct participation, as discussed in Cançado, Rigo and Pinheiro (2016). The theoretical approach to Social Management and the debates of the Social Management Network generated a research agenda, presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Synthesis of the proposed Research Agenda

| Topics of Research Agenda | Objectives |
|---------------------------|--|
| Inter-organizations and | Develop ways to "encourage" the creation of inter- |

| | |
|---|--|
| communities of practice | organizations and communities of practice, preferably in a complementary way. |
| A paradigm for Social Management | Build the first paradigm for Social Management. |
| | Demonstrate that the Social Management is multi-paradigmatic. |
| Application of the analysis framework | Improve the analytical framework |
| | Develop tools and mechanisms to apply the framework |
| | Using the analytical framework in different organizations in order to verify their Social Management possibilities |
| Geographical scale of Social Management | Identify the geographic scale possibilities of Social Management regarding direct and indirect participation |
| | Identify possibilities of using information and communication technologies for direct participation in the Social Management |

Source: Cançado, Pereira and Tenório (2015, p.195).

The topics of the research agenda are complementary and interdependent. The development of one of them is necessarily reflected in others. In any case, this article seeks to contribute directly to the topic "Application of the analyses framework", specifically with the objective of "improving the analytical framework".

The Nonprofit Sector

The Nonprofit Sector has significant importance in the Economy and Welfare across the globe. One example is that this sector is responsible for the most part of the growth of employment rates in most countries of Europe (Salamon & Sokolowski, 2018b). In the other hand, the participation of Third Sector in Economy is still small. According to the World Economic Forum (2019), there are 12 million of nonprofits worldwide, which represents 10% of the global workforce.

In terms of revenues, NPOs do not get it mostly from philanthropy, contrarily to what is commonly thought. Salamon and Sokolowski (2018b) say that 54% of the revenues come from private fees and sales, 37% from government and 9% from private philanthropy. Their research was conducted in 29 European countries.

Regarding the contribution to GDP, the NPOs contributed to 4.5% of the GDP (World Economic Forum, 2019). This quantity is in the same order of magnitude as the average of other sectors in these countries (World Bank, 2018), as shown in the Chart 2.

Table 2 Contribution to GDP by sector (%)

| Sector | Contribution to GDP (%) |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| NPOs | 4.5 |
| Agriculture | 3.0 |
| Industry | 26.0 |
| Manufacturing | 16.0 |
| Services | 50.5 |

Source: Adapted from World Bank (2018).

Turning now to the aspects of hand labor, it is pointed out that this sector employs, in 43 countries, 56 million full-time workers, equivalent to 5.5% of the economically active population of these countries (Salamon, 2016). This quantity may seem small, but the author points out that it is greater than a number of sectors in these countries, such as Utilities, Construction, Transportation, Communications and various manufacturing sectors taken individually.

According to Salamon (2016), in terms of voluntary labor, NPOs worldwide work with 42% of its work force in this modality. The financial value generated by their work is in average, 25% of the NPOs total contribution to GDP in their respective countries.

Considering the relevance of NPOs in a international level and the growth of studies regarding Social Management in Latin America (in Brazil especially), it was attempted in this study the comparison of the conceptual similarities and differences and the scope of work between the two themes. This type of conceptual and scope differentiation was also performed by Salamon and Sokolowski (2016) between NPOs and other constructs with regional importance as Cooperatives, *Mutuelles* and Social Ventures. Another differentiation made by these authors is between volunteer work and other forms of work without pay, as domestic work.

NPOs: Theory And Practice In Society

According to Smith and Grønbjerg (2006), the first authors to take up the task to define conceptually the NPOs were Salamon and Anheier (1992). In that context, they considered as NPOs organizations sharing five features: formal, private, non-profit-distributing, self-governing and voluntary. These features are described in more detail as following:

- **Formal:** they are institutionalized to some extent. For the authors, formalization didn't necessarily come by legal means. It can come also in the form of periodic meetings, existence of officers in the institution and procedural

rules. The authors didn't consider temporary and *ad hoc* groupings of people as formal, as this would lead to inaccuracies because of the form and the ephemerality of these groups.

- **Private:** they are institutionally separate from government. NPOs are not part of the government apparatus, neither governed by boards dominated by government officials. However, they may receive significant support from the government, as well as contain officials in his boards of directors. However, its structure is essentially private.

- **Non-profit-distributing:** they don't provide profits for its owners or directors. NPOs can accumulate profits, but must invest them in the organization itself, in order to provide resources to fulfill its mission. Profits, therefore, can't be directed to the owners or directors. In this sense, what differentiates NPOs from other private organizations is its main purpose of mission fulfilling instead of obtaining profit.

- **Self-governing:** equipped to control their own activities. NPOs have their own internal procedures for governance and are not controlled by external entities.

- **Voluntary:** involves significantly voluntary activity, be it in conducting the agency activities or in its management. This does not mean that most of its revenue is derived from volunteer work. Nor it means that most of the staff is voluntary. The presence of any income from volunteer work or volunteer in the board of directors is sufficient to say that organization is somehow voluntary.

Beyond the utility of setting the characteristics delimiting the NPOs, this structural definition was used by the John Hopkins Foundation to study the NPOs in many countries. This cross-cultural study was reported in detail in the book by Salamon and Anheier (1997).

The origins of this type of organization can be traced to many roots. Salamon (1994), for example, argues that the forms of Civil Society Organization that gained momentum in the 1990s originated from networks of mutual assistance that rose in socialist and communist regimes. More specifically, in that context of state immaturity, there was a widespread failure to provide good public services for the population, mainly due to lack of material resources to do so. In this sense, these mutual networks of assistance generated by proximity relationships developed. More recently, Krlev, Anheier and Mildemberger (2018) consider that the type of government failure to

provide public services depends on three variables: type of welfare regime, variant of capitalism involved, type of nonprofit regimes.

More specifically in the developed western countries, the author argues that the Social Welfare State emerged in the 1950s, collapsing in the mid 1980s. Some reasons for this collapse were the Oil Crisis in the 1970s and the World Recession in the 1980s.

Among developed countries, Salamon (1994) described many top-down movements to foster NPOs. For example, Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher encouraged the emergence of NPOs in order to reduce government spending in their countries. In the same vein, François Mitterrand liberalized laws to donate to charity and created a special Secretariat for the Social Economy, *Mutuelles*, Cooperatives and Associations. In Norway and Japan there are also government funding initiatives to NPOs.

It should be noted therefore that, conceptually, even organizations that do not seek the common good according to international criteria of human rights are viewed as NPOs, according to Salamon and Anheier (1992) definition. Morris (2000), in this regard, points out problems in the NPO concept proposed by Salamon and Anheier (1992), for example, they did not consider as criteria if there are positive externalities for society as a whole.

Another concern from Morris (2000) involves the dangers of universalizing the criteria to define NPOs between different cultures and between organizations historically situated at different times. In her view, this kind of analysis will exclude organizations that are socially relevant in their specific contexts and that could be considered as NPOs according to other criteria. However, she didn't offer a plausible and precise conceptualization of NPOs.

Salamon (2010) seeks to solve this problem inductively redefining the **characteristics that define NPIs (Non-profit Institutions) in different cultures:**

- **Different production function:** the NPI cannot be a source of revenue, profit or financial gain for their owners or directors. However, they can structure a NPI to make a profit to reinvest and to have tax exemption or tribute incentives.

- **Public-goods production:** the NPIs produce goods and services that benefit the community as a whole, not only its members. The goods and service they produce, in the author's words, are difficult to finance only by market arrangements. In addition, according to Hansmann (1987), they have the

possibility of producing public goods with less bureaucracy, more flexibility and lower cost than the State.

- **Different governance structures:** the NPIs are not submitted to public election of its officers or to government commandment. They are controlled by their members or direction boards that are frequently self-perpetuating. They can dissolve, choose and change their internal rules, as well as change their missions or internal structures using their own authority. On the other hand, Leardini, Rossi, Moggi and Zardini (2016) observed that the presence of community stakeholders on the board of directors increases the legitimacy of the NPO within the community in which it operates.

- **Distinctive revenue structure:** they can have access to resources from different sources. However, in the author's words, they always receive part of the funds by private charity donations.

- **Distinctive staffing structure:** Its main workforce is composed usually by paid and voluntary labor. Many NPIs, however, operate only with voluntary labor. This feature makes it difficult to measure the economic activity in NPIs because the existing databases (e.g. SNA - System of National Accounts of the United States) do not quantify systematically the economic variables related to voluntary work, like the service provision by volunteers.

- **Different tax treatment:** often the NPIs accomplish tax exemption or deduction in a different way of other private organizations.

- **Distinctive legal treatment:** the NPIs receive different legal and regulatory treatment in countries in which they operate. They may include in their respective countries organizations as associations, foundations, companies limited by guarantee, public benefit organizations, nonprofit corporations, public utility corporations, non-stock corporations and trusts.

However, when trying to set again in a formal way what would be the NPIs, Salamon (2010) point out five very similar characteristics proposed earlier (Salamon & Anheier, 1992): NPIs are private Non-Profit Organizations, with internal governance mechanisms and decisional autonomy in relation to the government; additionally, the participation of its members is not mandatory, that is, it is based on individual choice or consent. It is notable in the new proposed definition that the production of public goods aspect is still missing. The author argued, however, that this set of features is useful because of its operability in virtually all countries.

More recently, Salamon and Sokolowski (2016) summarized three characteristics distinctive of NPOs: privateness, public purpose and free choice (uncoerced participation of its members). In this sense, it is clear that finally it was given attention to the critics found in the literature in relation to the Social Welfare generation criteria, as seen in Morris (2000). However, it is still present in Salamon and Sokolowski (2016) the defense of the five NPOs features present in 1992 and 2010.

Salamon and Sokolowski (2018a) consider that this definition separates clearly the NPOs and NPIs from other institutions such as for-profit businesses, government agencies and households. Beyond that, Salamon and Sokolowski (2018a) still see the same traits in common between all NPOs/NPIs: privateness (outside of governmental sphere), public purpose (in production of goods/services directed at the common good), free choice (non-mandatory participation). It can be seen that these traits converge with Tenório and Cançado (op. cit) definition of Social Management.

A possible way to differentiate between the types of NPOs was proposed by Frumkin and Andre-Clark (2000, p. 160), as shown in the Figure 1, as follows. The authors choose as criteria the NPO commitment to values and mission vs. its operational/financial performance.

Figure 1 Values vs. Performance in NPOs

| | | | |
|----------------------|------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Commitment to Values | High | <i>Charitable Nonprofit</i> | <i>Nonprofit "Star"</i> |
| | Low | <i>Nonprofit "Dog"</i> | <i>Commercial Nonprofit</i> |
| | | Low | High |
| | | Commitment to Performance | |

Source: Frumkin and Andre-Clark (2000, p. 160).

In their view, it is necessary that the NPOs value their differential, that is, the attention to its mission considering non-economic criteria/administrative performance. However, it is also strongly necessary to meet the operational efficiency requirement, otherwise the organization ceases to exist and fulfill its social purpose.

Next, proposals of NPO characterization (and NPI) are summarized according to the authors in the Table 3.

Table 3 Propositions to Characterization of NPO (and NPI)

| Salamon and Anheier (1992) | Salamon (2010) NPI | Salamon and Sokolowski (2016, 2018a) | Frumkin and Andre-Clark (2000) |
|--|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formal (not necessary by legal means) - Private - Non-profit-distributing - Self-governing - Voluntary | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different production function - Public-goods production - Different governance structures - Distinctive revenue structure - Distinctive staff structure - Different tax treatment - Different legal treatment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Privateness - Public purpose - Free choice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commitment to Values and Mission - Commitment to operational/ financial performance |

Source: compiled from Salamon and Anheier (1992), Salamon (2010), Salamon and Sokolowski (2016, 2018a) and Frumkin and Andre-Clark (2000)

In view of this, we ratify that any decision making goes through the strengthening of democratic processes, closely related to the collective and republican (SANTOS, 2019), which in our view means promoting a broad listening with students, parents, teachers and the school community in general, bearing in mind that they are the most directly affected in this time of pandemic. In this sense, we agree that decision makers who consider the democratic process have a better chance of getting it right.

It is important to emphasize that we defend the fulfillment of principle IX, art. 3, of Law nº 9.394, of December 20, 1996 - LDB 9394/96 (BRAZIL, 1996), which deals with the "guarantee of minimum quality standard", as well as art. 4, item IX, which defines that the duty of the State with public education will be effected through "minimum standards of teaching quality, defined as variety and minimum quantities, per student, of indispensable inputs for the development of the teaching-learning process".

On a legal basis, we cannot accept replacing the teacher's pedagogical action with non-presential activities such as distance education, especially via the Internet, through digital platforms and/or applications, as many students will be excluded from the objectives of the curriculum and the right to learning.

From the perspective of treating education as a right, therefore inclusive, and not as a privilege, we point out a single alternative: carrying out face-to-face activities after

the pandemic, considering that the school year does not need to accompany the calendar year.

We understand that the pandemic has opened up social inequalities, which implies a great deal in educational inequality, since the most economically vulnerable students, as well as those who live in the countryside, riverine, indigenous and quilombola communities, will not perform satisfactorily in school activities carried out at a distance, for various reasons: lack of computer/tablet and internet; lack of support and guidance from parents and/or guardians; lack of strategic and structured pedagogical plans; teachers without the necessary training and structure to monitor and offer content, among others.

The Collaboration Regime and Democratic Management as opposed to Public-Private Partnerships in Teacher Training in Basic Education of the State of Tocantins

In times of pandemic caused by COVID - 19, which resulted in the need for social isolation and suspension of classes in the State of Tocantins, two factors bother us regarding the quality of public basic education: (i) the possibility / imminence of strengthening public partnerships -private with institutes and foundations and (ii) the opening for the expansion of Distance Education, which in our view greatly compromises democratic educational management and, of course, the quality of public education.

COVID's Pandemia - 19 certainly accelerated the logic of education as a virtual activity, since several companies and platforms started offering their digital tools to state and municipal education departments, both for teacher training and for teaching in basic education. But, who wins or who is interested in Distance Education (EAD)? Several specialists, such as Daniel Cara, denounce this service as profitable for entrepreneurs, telephone companies, distance education platforms, business foundations, since they already commercialize this modality in practice.

We agree that in the pandemic period, continuing distance education appears as a viable alternative for education professionals and other civil servants in the State of Tocantins not to interrupt their studies, provided that technological conditions and instruments are guaranteed to enable the acquisition of skills. necessary for the performance of these in favor of professional training, as well as the exercise of teaching practice with students.

However, there is an evident gap related to the training of basic education teachers in the State of Tocantins with regard to the use of technologies in the school

environment. To better understand how the education professional training policy is structured, it is necessary to understand how the educational systemic organization took place in this context, with a magnifying glass for public-private partnership relations.

According to Lagares (2008), the institutionalization process of the State Education System of Tocantins started with Law nº 653, of January 19, 1994 (TOCANTINS, 1994), at the height of the neoliberal ideology that oriented towards privatizations and the outsourcing of public policies in general and education in particular (SANTOS, 2019).

In Tocantins, based on Santos (2019), since the first norm of the Education System in 1994, the educational policies implemented showed the absence of a political plan to improve the state's basic public education, which facilitated the alignment with the guidelines of the State. Master Plan for the Reform of the State Apparatus (PDRAE) (BRASIL, 1995) and Constitutional Amendment No. 19 of 1998 (BRASIL, 1998) (ADRIÃO and BEZERRA, 2013; PERONI, 2013; ARELARO, 2014; SANTOS, 2017), and the opening for active participation of civil society, the so-called Third Sector, in the planning, definition and implementation of public educational policies, with the establishment of public-private partnerships between the State Government, through the State Education Secretariat (Seduc-TO), with Institutes and Foundations aiming to serve market interests, mainly, starting in 2003 (LAGARES, SANTOS and SILVA, 2017; SANTOS, 2019).

Historically, the State's educational leaders have appointed the private sector as responsible for conducting Tocantins' public educational policies, as shown in the table below.

Table 4 Synthesis of Convergences and Divergences between Social Management and NPOs/NPIs.

| NPO Authors | Convergences | Divergences |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Salamon and Anheier (1992) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formal (not necessary by legal means) - Self-governing - Voluntary | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private (excluding solidarity economic enterprises and cooperatives) - Non-profit-distributing |
| Salamon (2010) - NPI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public-goods production - Different governance structures - Distinctive revenue structure - Distinctive staff structure - Different legal treatment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different production function - Different tax treatment |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Salamon and Sokolowski (2016, 2018a) | - Public purpose - Free choice | - Privateness (excluding solidarity economic enterprises and cooperatives) |
| Frumkin and Andre-Clark (2000) | - Commitment to Values and Mission | - Commitment to operational/ financial performance |

Source: compiled from Salamon and Anheier (1992), Salamon (2010), Salamon and Sokolowski (2016, 2018a) and Frumkin and Andre-Clark (2000).

Getting deeper in the facts of Chart 4, the divergences are related to the private character of NPOs and the question of the role of money in these organizations. The role of money is not a direct preoccupation of Social Management. The collective decision making of Social Management obviously impacts the community development and its incomes, but not the productions of goods and services for community.

The convergences, on the other hand, indicate that most of the characteristics of an NPO are compatible with the Social Management construct. The search for the common good beyond the state (Self-governing, Different Governance Structures and Distinctive Staff Structure), through different investment alternatives (Voluntary, Distinctive Revenue Structure and Different Legal Treatment), is a strong point of convergence.

After this comparison, some prospects can be done for the Social Management theory contribute the NPOs debate. The first and probably the most important, is the Adornian Negative Dialectics. The NPO definitions presented in this paper are basic systematic rules to classify organizations, but it not deepens the relationships between categories. Those categories are like a "check list" to considerate the organizations as NPO (or NPI). The Adornian Negative Dialectics can be an interesting way to construct relationships between types of NPO or simply make their coexistence more significant. The NPOs have many processes of fundraising and accounting together with other organizations, which makes the study of their partnerships with other types of organizations more relevant.

Final considerations

It can be concluded that Social Management can be an alternative of management for these organizations. The limits in terms of decision-making power of the board of directors or owners of these organizations must be discussed, since they are effectively private. On the other hand, one can think of an NPO managed collectively for the

collectivity, in a perspective close to the collective-philosopher-king (Oliveira & Cançado, 2014).

The main result of this work, however, is linked to the possibilities of collectivization of the NPOs in communities that can effectively assume their protagonism. The development of these Public Spheres of Collective decision-making diminishes the need for outside interventions by organizations and the Government itself. The intention is not to diminish the importance of those interventions, but to show another more endogenous path of development or self-development. Thus, the community, through Social Management, will be more involved in the process as a whole: choosing priorities, ways to solve problems, implementing actions and evaluating results. Consequently, the responsibility of the community for its development increases with the legitimacy of the solutions found.

One limitation that is found in both theories (Social Management and NPOs), however, is that there are still divergences between main concepts and action guidelines. This feature leaves both theories open to growth and adaptation to current social changes. These changes currently may be viewed as: (1) in how to include more people geographically distant with similar mindset in the NPOs using new digital platforms and (2) how to include progressively more people in the local communities through popular participation processes using features from Brazilian Social Management and digital/educational inclusion.

Future researchers may benefit from these tracks that are open to find communities that need self-expression via NPO creation and sustenance. As Krlev, Anheier and Mildenerger (2018) show, the NPOs are more open to social innovation practices than their public managed counterparts. These communities may find even more innovative forms of management inside the NPOs to be included in the international Social Management theory, in order to keep the field diverse and open to the emerging local and global trends.

References

- Adorno, T. W. (1973) *Negative Dialectics*. London, UK: A&C Black.
- Araújo, E. T. (2012) *(In)consistências da gestão social e seus processos de formação: um campo em construção*. Doctoral dissertation in Social Service, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, Brazil.
- Arendt, H. (2013) *The human condition* University of Chicago Press.

- Barbacena, J. M. (2009) Ação popular e participação política: um diálogo com a teoria democrática de Aléxis de Tocqueville. *Revista Urutágua*, 17(1), 18-28.
- Blumer, A., Ehrenfeucht, A., Haussler, D. & Warmuth, M. K. (1987) Occam's Razor. *Information processing letters*, 24(6), 377-380.
- Cançado, A. C. (2011) Fundamentos teóricos da gestão social. Doctoral dissertation in Management. Universidade Federal de Lavras, Minas Gerais, Brazil.
- Cançado, A. C. (2013a) Gestão social: um debate para a construção do campo. *NAU Social*, 4(6), 191-209.
- Cançado, A. C. (2013b) Gestão social: aprofundando a discussão. Post-doctoral Report. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas.
- Cançado, A. C. (2016) Gestão Social e Economia Solidária: para além do mimetismo: outra gestão é possível? *Revista de Economia Solidária*, 10, 1, 19-43.
- Cançado, A. C., Pereira, J. R. & Tenório, F. G. (2015) Gestão social: epistemologia de um paradigma. 2. ed. Curitiba, Brazil: CRV.
- Cançado, A. C., Rigo, A. S., Iwamoto, H. M., & Pinheiro, L. S. (2019). Gestão social, autogestão e gestão democrática pela Navalha de Occam: uma abordagem conceitual baseada na teoria dos conjuntos. *NAU Social*, 10(18), 17-26.
- Cançado, A. C., Rigo, A. S. & Pinheiro, L. S. (2016) Por una agenda de investigación para la gestión social: control social, paradigma, escala y cuadro de análisis. *Praxis sociológica*, 21(1), 65-94.
- Cançado, A. C., Tavares, B. & Dallabrida, R. (2013) Gestão Social e Governança Territorial: interseções e especificidades teórico-práticas. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional*, 9(3), 313-353.
- Cançado, A. C., Tenório, F. G. & Pereira, J. R. (2011) Gestão social: reflexões teóricas e conceituais. *Cadernos EBAPE.Brazil*, 9(3), 681-703.
- Cançado, A. C., Villela, L. E. & Sausen, J. O. (2016) Gestão social e gestão estratégica: reflexões sobre as diferenças e aproximações de conceitos. *Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental*, 10(3), 69-84.
- Carrion, R. M. (2007) Gestão social: especificidades e práticas em discussão. In: Silva, J. G., Faria, A., Bianco, M., Behr, R. & Petinelli-Souza, S. (eds.). *Tecnologias de gestão: por uma abordagem multidisciplinar*. 2. Vitória, Brazil: EDUFES, 108-124.
- Dworkin, G. (1999) Positive and negative freedom. In: Audi, R. (ed.) *The Cambridge dictionary of philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, 723.
- Feyerabend, P. (1970) *Against method*. Minneapolis, USA: University of Minnesota Press.

- Fischer, T. (2002) Poderes locais, desenvolvimento e gestão: introdução a uma agenda. In: Fischer, T. (ed.). *Gestão do desenvolvimento e poderes locais: marcos teóricos e avaliação*. Salvador, Brazil: Casa da Qualidade, 12-32.
- França Filho, G. C. (2008) Definindo Gestão Social. In: Silva Jr., J. T., Mâsih, R. T., Cançado, A. C. & Schommer, C. (eds). *Gestão Social: práticas em debate, teorias em construção*. Fortaleza, Brazil: Imprensa Universitária, 27-37.
- Frumkin, P. & Andre-Clark, A. (2000) When missions, markets and politics collide: Values and strategy in the nonprofit human services. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, 29(1), 141-163.
- Gahyva, H. (2006) Tocqueville e Gobineau no mundo dos iguais. *Dados*, 49(3), 553-582.
- Habermas, J. (1991) *The structural transformation of the Public Sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Massachusetts: MIT press.
- Habermas, J. (1996) *Between facts and norms: contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Hansmann, H. (1987) Economic theories of nonprofit organization. In: Powell, W. W. & Steinberg, R. (eds.) *The Nonprofit Sector: A research handbook*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 27-42.
- Horkheimer, M. (1976) Traditional and critical theory. In: Horkheimer, M. *Critical theory: selected essays*. New York: Continuum Publishing Company, 188-243.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1972). *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Jasmin, M. G. (2005) *Alexis de Tocqueville: A historiografia como ciência da política*. Belo Horizonte, Brazil: UFMG, IUPERJ.
- Krlev, G., Anheier, H.K. & Mildemberger, G. (2018) Social Innovation: What is it and who makes it? In: Anheier, H., Krlev, G. & Mildemberger, G. *Social Innovation: comparative perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 3-35.
- Kuhn, T. S. (2012) *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakatos, I. (1976) Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In: Harding, S. (ed.) *Can theories be refuted?* Houten, Netherlands: Springer, 205-259.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Leardini, C., Rossi, G., Moggi, S. & Zardini, A. (2016) When the law shapes nonprofit boards: the key role of local stakeholders. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(1), 47-70.
- Lukes, S. (2001) Emancipation. In: Bottomore, T. (ed.) *Dictionary of marxist thought*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell-Publishing, 172-173,
- Marx, K. (1978) On the Jewish Question. In: Tucker, R. (ed.) *The Marx-Engels reader*. New York: Norton and Company, 26-46.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1969) *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. In: Marx, K. & Engels, F. *Marx/Engels Selected Works*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 98-137.
- Marcuse, H. (2007) *One-dimensional man: studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Marcuse, H. (2009) *Philosophy and critical theory*. In: Marcuse, H. *Negations: essays in Critical Theory*. London: Mayfly, 99-118.
- Morris, S. (2000) Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Some lessons from history. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 11(1), 25-43.
- Oliveira, A. & Cançado, A. C. (2014) Platão e a Gestão da Sociedade: Contribuições da Politeia à Gestão Social. *Revista Interdisciplinar de Gestão Social*. 4(1), 13-36.
- Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge university press.
- Paes-de-Paula, A. P. (2008) *Teoria crítica nas organizações*. São Paulo, Brazil: Thomson Learning.
- Pires, A., Silva, S. D. A. M., Fonseca, S. A., Vendramini, P., & Coelho, F. D. S. (2014). Dossiê campo de públicas no Brasil: definição, movimento constitutivo e desafios atuais. *Administração Pública e Gestão Social*, 6(3), 109-167.
- Ramos, A. G. (1981) *The new science of organizations: A reconceptualization of the wealth of nations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rovida, G. (1985) *Revolution and the Spanish Civil War*. In: Hobsbawm, E. J. (ed.) *History from Below: studies in Popular Protest and Popular Ideology*. Hemel Hempstead, United Kingdom: Harvester Press, 337-375.
- Salamon, L. M. (1994) The rise of the Nonprofit Sector. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(4), 109-122.
- Salamon, L. M. (2010) The changing context of nonprofit leadership and management. In: Renz, D. O. (ed.). *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of nonprofit leadership and management*. Hoboken, USA: John Wiley and Sons, 77-100.

- Salamon, L. M. (2016) Putting NPIs and the Third Sector on the economic map of the world. Proceedings... Session of the United Nations Statistical Commission. 47. 1-30, New York, NY.
- Salamon, L. M. & Anheier, H. K. (1992) In search of the non-profit sector. I: The question of definitions. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 3(2), 125-151.
- Salamon, L. M. & Anheier, H. K. (1997) *Defining the Nonprofit Sector: a cross-national analysis*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Salamon, L. M. & Sokolowski, S. W. (2016) Beyond nonprofits: re-conceptualizing the Third Sector. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(1), 1-31.
- Salamon, L. M. & Sokolowski, W. (2018a) Beyond Nonprofits: in search of the Third Sector. In: Enjolras, B., Salamon, L., Sivesind, K. H. & Zimmer, A. (eds.) *The Third Sector as a Renewable Resource for Europe: concepts, impacts, challenges and opportunities*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 7-48.
- Salamon, L. M. & Sokolowski, W. (2018b) The size and composition of the european third sector in: Enjolras, B., Salamon, L., Sivesind, K. H. & Zimmer, A. (eds.) *The Third Sector as a Renewable Resource for Europe: concepts, impacts, challenges and opportunities*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 49-94.
- Santos, B. S. (2010) *Pela mão de Alice: O social e o político na pós-modernidade*. São Paulo, Brazil: Cortez.
- Smith, S. R. & Grønbjerg, K.A. (2006) Scope and theory of government-nonprofit relations. In: Powell, W. W. & Steinberg, A. (eds.) *The Nonprofit Sector: A research handbook*. New Haven, USA: Yale University Press, 221-242.
- Sgró, M. (2007) *Educação pós-filosófica na história: racionalidade e emancipação*. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Tenório, F. G. (1997) Superando a ingenuidade: minha dívida a Guerreiro Ramos. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 31(5), 29-44.
- Tenório, F. G. (1998) Gestão social: uma perspectiva conceitual. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 32(5), 7-23.
- Tenório, F. G. (2005) (Re)visitando o conceito de gestão social. *Desenvolvimento em Questão*, 3(5), 101-124.
- Tenório, F. G. (2010) Gestão Social: uma réplica. In: Rigo, A. S., Silva Jr. J. T., Cançado, A. C. & Schommer, C. *Gestão social e políticas públicas de desenvolvimento: ações, articulações e agenda*. Recife, Brazil: UNIVASF.

Tenório, F. G. (2012) (ed.) Cidadania e desenvolvimento local: critérios de análise. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: FGV.

Tocqueville, A. (1835/2003) Democracy in America. Washington: Regnery Publishing.

Tragtenberg, M. (2005) Administração, poder e ideologia. São Paulo, Brazil: UNESP.

Vasconcellos-Sobrinho, M., Alves, M. & Albuquerque-Vasconcellos, A. M. (2016) Gestão municipal da política nacional de habitação de interesse social: o trabalho técnico social na gestão de projetos habitacionais em assentamentos precários em Ananindeua, estado do Pará. Desenvolvimento em Questão, 14(34), 127-154.

World Economic Forum. How the tech world could make nonprofits a more powerful force. (2019, Jan 02). Retrieved in Dec. 21, 2019 at

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/01/tech-world-nonprofit-activism/>

World Bank. World Development Indicators: structure of output (2018). Retrieved in Dec. 21, 2019 at <http://wdi.worldbank.org/table/4.2>

RESUMO:

O artigo apresenta as convergências e divergências entre a teoria das organizações sem fins lucrativos (OSFL) e a Gestão Social. A seguir, são apresentadas as possibilidades de desenvolvimento da Gestão Social na OSFL. No final do artigo, as principais contribuições da teoria da gestão social brasileira para o debate internacional sem fins lucrativos são resumidas e deixam em aberto algumas diretrizes para futuros pesquisadores que desejem seguir esse fluxo de pesquisa.

PALAVRAS-CHAVES: Gestão Social. Organizações Sem Fins Lucrativos. Terceiro Setor.

RESUMEN:

El artículo presenta las convergencias y divergencias entre la teoría de las organizaciones sin fines de lucro (OSFL) y la Gestión Social. A continuación se presentan las posibilidades de desarrollo de la Gestión Social en OSFL. Al final del artículo, se resumen las principales aportaciones de la teoría de la Gestión Social brasileña al debate internacional sobre las organizaciones Sin Fines de Lucro y dejan algunas pautas abiertas para futuros investigadores que deseen seguir este flujo de investigación

PALABRAS-CLAVES: Gestión Social. Organizaciones Sin Fines de Lucro. Tercer sector.