

NON-PROFIT FOUNDATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS FOR CULTURE AND RECREATION IN THE 2005 IBGE/IPEA CENSUS: LEISURE, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS ISSUES

*AS FASFILs DE CULTURA E RECREAÇÃO NO CENSO IBGE/IPEA 2005:
QUESTÕES PARA O LAZER, ESPORTES E EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA*

*LAS FASFILs DE CULTURA Y RECREACIÓN EN EL CENSO IBGE/IPEA 2005:
TEMAS PARA EL OCIO, DEPORTE Y EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA*

Marcelo Paula Melo*

Keywords:
Censuses.
Sports.
Leisure activities.

Abstract: The undeniable growth of so-called non-profit organizations has as its substrate the expansion of forms of relationship with governments and access to public funds in the wake of the neoliberal project under implementation of society in many countries. The fields of sport and leisure are greatly influenced by that process. This paper analyzes the so-called FASFILs based on the 2005 IBGE/IPEA Census. More specifically, the focus will be on the "Culture and Recreation" field, with its direct interface in Physical Education and Leisure.

Palavras chave:
Censos.
Esportes.
Atividades de lazer.

Resumo: O inegável crescimento das chamadas organizações sem fins de lucro tem como substrato a expansão das formas de relação com os governos e o acesso ao fundo público no bojo da implementação do projeto neoliberal de sociedade em diversos países. Os campos de esporte e lazer sofrem grande influência desse processo. O objetivo deste texto é realizar uma análise, a partir do CENSO IBGE IPEA 2005, das chamadas Associações Sem Fins de Lucro (FASFILs). Mais especificamente, o foco estará no campo Cultura e Recreação, com sua interface direta na Educação Física e Lazer.

Palabras clave:
Censos.
Deportes.
Actividades recreativas.

Resumen: El innegable crecimiento de las llamadas organizaciones sin fines de lucro tiene como sustrato la expansión de las formas de relación con los gobiernos y el acceso a los fondos públicos como parte de la implementación del proyecto neoliberal de sociedad en diversos países. Las áreas del deporte y del ocio sufren una gran influencia de este proceso. El objetivo de este trabajo es analizar, a partir del Censo IBGE 2005 IPEA, las llamadas Asociaciones sin Fines de Lucro (FASFILs). Más específicamente, la atención se centrará en el campo "Cultura y Recreación", con su interfaz directa en Educación Física y Ocio.

*Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ),
Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.
E-mail: marcelaomelo@gmail.com.

Received on: 01.30.2015
Approved on: 08.04.2015



1 GETTING STARTED

The work of private non-profit organizations in implementing social policies has been an important point in Brazilian state action in recent decades. Their expansion as well as their naturalized acceptance by several political parties, individual organic intellectuals, and groups of various political colors indicates that this central aspect of the neoliberal project of State Reform has found acceptance in Brazil, with the approval of legislation starting in the late 1990s. The basis for this situation was an increase in both the number of organizations (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008) and the volume of contracts and agreements they established with governments at their three levels (BRASIL, 2010).

This article aims to provide a detailed analysis of data from the 2005 Census conducted by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (*Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatísticas*, IBGE) and the Institute of Applied Economic Research (*Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada*, IPEA) on the so-called Non-Profit Foundations and Associations (*Fundações e Associações Sem Fins de Lucro*, known as FASFILs). More specifically, it will focus on the organizations that make up the subfield of Culture and Recreation. This is one of the ten subfields into which FASFILs were divided according to their area of operation. That subfield includes two divisions: a) Sport and Recreation; and b) Culture and Art. We understand that these two subfields of Culture and Recreation are directly related to the provision of sports and/or leisure programs (under agreements with governments, state companies, private or international organizations). In light of the data, we will conduct analysis of their constitution, year of foundation, average number of staff per organization and average salary, considering Brazil's regional division. The theoretical support of a number of studies on civil society, social policy, State theory, and the neoliberal project (COUTINHO, 2006, NEVES, 2010, MELO, 2011, HÚNGARO; OLIVEIRA; ATHAYDE, 2011) will allow us to go beyond figures and percentages and place them in Brazilian reality. This text follows the same structure of Húngaro, Oliveira and Athayde (2011), who worked with the 2002 IPEA-IBGE Census on the so-called third sector. Because of its pioneering role in the field of studies on sports policy, those authors devoted attention to data in the subfield of Sport and Recreation, which are included in the field of Culture and Recreation. As a methodological choice and/or due to space restriction, they left out the analysis of the organizations on the other subfield of that group, namely, Culture and Art. In discussing the two subfields within Culture and Recreation in the 2005 Census, more than updating the pioneering work of Hungarian, Oliveira and Athayde (2011), we will go further by broadening the database to be analyzed. Nevertheless, we will bring theoretical analyses associated with Brazil's and the world's recent historical development regarding the role of civil society organizations known as FASFILs in the IBGE document.

2 PROLOGUE OR SITUATING THE IBGE-IPEA FASFIL CENSUS

The IBGE-IPEA FASFIL Census intends to know this field further – a pressing issue due to the State's operating model resulting from neoliberal reforms – by broadening partnerships with such organizations in civil society in implementing social policies. The Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) joined the Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA), with the assistance of the Brazilian NGOs Association (*Associação Brasileira de ONGS*, ABONG) and the Group of Institutes, Foundations and Enterprises (*Grupo de Institutos, Fundações e*

Empresas, GIFE) to collect nationwide data on all those organizations. The project generated three editions of the FASFIL Census. The first edition was published in 2004, including 2002 data; the second edition was published in 2008, including 2005 data; and in 2012 the third edition presented data from 2010. This article will work only with 2005 data (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008).

The Ministry of Finance's Central Register of Enterprises (*Cadastro Central de Empresas*, CEMPRE), the registration in the National Register of Legal Organizations (*Cadastro Nacional de Pessoa Jurídica*, CNPJ), the Annual Social Information Registry (*Relação Anual de Informações Sociais*, RAIS) and the General Register of Employed and Unemployed Workers (*Cadastro Geral de Empregados e Desempregados*, CAGED) were crucial for data on so-call non-profit organizations to be accurate. CEMPRE includes organizations' corporate names, full addresses, trade names, classifications of core activity, years of foundation, and legal codes (this is in the subgroup in legal code 3). The group consists of 16 subdivisions: Notary and Registry Service (notary); Social organization; Civil Society Organization of Public Interest; Other Foundations maintained with private funds; Autonomous Social Service; Condos; Implementing Unit (Program Direct Money in School-TSA); Prior Conciliation Commission; Mediation and Arbitration Entity; Political Party; Trade Union; Establishment of a foreign foundation or association in Brazil; Foundation or association based in a foreign country; Religious organization; Indigenous community, and Other Forms of Association. Note that so-called Non-Profit Foundations and Associations (FASFILs) are a subcategory of this vast universe, including some of the groups mentioned above. We expressly excluded: a) political parties; b) labor unions, federations and confederations; c) condominiums; d) Notary; e) The so-called "S" System; f) School Funds and similar agents; g) conciliation and arbitration agencies; h) Preliminary conciliation committees; i) municipal councils and consortia; J) Cemeteries and funeral homes.

The Census adopted international standards based on the United Nations Statistics Division, which enables comparisons with other countries and even with previous and later studies, adopting five criteria for the precise definition of organizations called FASFILs. To be FASFILs, organizations shall:

- 1) Be private, with no ties to the State apparatus;
- 2) Have no declared profit, not distribute profits among owners or directors. When they generate profits, these should be invested in the organization itself, in so-called core activities.
- 3) Be legally constituted;
- 4) Be self-administered, i. e., to be able to manage their own activities;
- 5) Work on a voluntary basis, in terms of deliberate associative participation of any individual or group of people freely decided by partners or founders (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008).

The Civil Code has only three legal figures that would be included in the above: Foundations, Associations, and Religious Organizations. That excludes a number of organizations that, even being theoretically non-profit, would not be under Non-Profit Foundations and Associations (FASFILs).

The 2005 IBGE-IPEA Census indicates that FASFILs are more than half (56.2%) of nonprofits in Brazil (338,162 FASFILs in a total of 601,611 organizations) and represent 5.6% of public and private organizations registered at CEMPRE – there was a 22.6% increase over

2002 (275,895 FASFILs). In 2005, that number jumped to 338,162 organizations (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008).

In 2005, Brazilian FASFILs were 12.3 years old on average, and 41.5% (or 140,261 organizations) had emerged in the 1990s. It is also worth noting the explosion of organizations in 2000s (until 2005), with the emergence of 89,166 of them, representing 26.3% of total organizations. The years of implementation of the neoliberal project in Brazil (the administrations of PSDB's Fernando Henrique Cardoso and one administration of PT's Luis Inácio Lula da Silva) (COUTINHO, 2006; NEVES, 2010; MELO, 2011) saw exponential growth in the number of FASFILs. In 1996 (2nd year of Cardoso's 1st administration), Brazil had 107,300 FASFILs. This figure rose to 338.162 million in 2005 (3rd year of Lula da Silva's 1st administration) – a 215.1% increase in the number of organizations. On the other hand, only 13.1% of FASFILs were created before 1980 (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008, p. 46).

The censuses include ten major areas of expertise – and their subdivisions: A) Housing (456 organizations corresponding to 0.1% of the total); B) Health (4,464 organizations or 1.3% of the total); C) Culture and Recreation (46,999 organizations; 13.9%); D) Education and Research (19,940 organizations; 5.9%); E) Social Services (39,395 organizations; 11.6%); F) Religion (83,775; 24.8%); G); Environment and Animal Protection (2,562 organizations; 0.8%); H) Development and Rights Protection (60,259 organizations; 17.8%); I) Employers' and Professional Associations (58,796 organizations; 17.4%); J) Other Private Foundations and Nonprofit Associations not specified above (21,516; 6.4%).

3 FASFILS, SPORT AND LEISURE: THE CULTURE AND RECREATION FIELD IN THE 2005 CENSUS

The debate on the so-called social projects might be intoxicated by a cloud supposedly based on solidarity and guaranteeing and/or promoting citizenship. At the same time, organizations presented as part of a so-called third sector seek to associate their activities to alleged higher efficiency and agility compared to State agencies. Not disregarding occasional contributions in each specific case, but also not generalizing as if they were the field as a whole, positions praised as redeeming lost citizenship tend to blind us to the conditions involving social projects themselves. This is expressed in Garanhani and El Tassa's (2013, p. 274) advocacy of social projects as:

[...] an exercise in citizenship, since, besides engaging people in their daily experiences, they lead to overcome barriers of prejudices present in society for the benefit of the other. Thus, participation in a social project arouses the feeling of solidarity and contributes to raise individuals' awareness about the role they play in the socio-cultural and economic context to which they belong.

That exercise of citizenship, supposedly overcoming barriers of prejudice and awakening feelings of solidarity, makes up the classical repertoire of those who advocate social project as redeemers of social problems – although Garanhani and El Tassa's (2013) analysis focuses on the government program Segundo Tempo. So much so that the authors argue that Segundo Tempo – a nationwide program based on agreements with municipalities and therefore vastly diverse due to the reality of each unit in daily implementation – through “[...] sports practices offered” – would unquestioningly promote (supposed),

[...] social inclusion, physical well-being, health promotion, human development and the exercise of citizenship, and the professionals responsible for the project

are teachers and students (interns) of Physical Education and/or Sport and related areas (GARANHANI; EL TASSA, 2013, p. 277).

Regardless of political and/or professional affinity with the program in question and the group in power, from a scientific point of view, pointing out its a priori inherent properties with such high generalization sounds at least exaggerated, if not overly optimistic. Concepts such as social inclusion, human development and exercise of citizenship are not self-explanatory. In times of battle in the realm of ideas, it is necessary to precisely express their claims and their reach. They are not neutral concepts, as indeed no concept is. As stated by Hecktheuer and Silva (2011, p. 117), it is a logic that migrated from schooling to sports as the supposed redeemer of social ills, since it can “make individuals’ vulnerable exactly when proposing to contribute to minimize a state of vulnerability – which sets a new paradox”.

The meanings of the term “social projects” should be captured considering its polysemy. Government actions performed by state agencies or private organizations with state funding sometimes receive that designation. In this case, we consider it a mistake with serious consequences. We prefer to use the term “public policy”, established in literature and historic struggle for expanding social rights through the allocation of public funds to meet workers’ historical demands on several fronts, whether or not they are performed by an organ within the state apparatus. On the other hand, “social projects” refer to fully private actions funded by companies or other organizations in civil society (including foreign ones) and implementation actions by FASFILs. It would be more accurate to call the latter “Social Projects”. Confusion regarding these concepts leaves plenty of room for explicit or indirect privatization of state action. As a result of contradictions, antagonistic and/or divergent interests among social classes (and also within the fundamental social classes), not expressing very clear distinctions between state and private actions plays an important role in legitimizing the privatizing logic that accompanies the neoliberal project of society (MELO, 2011).

The 2005 IBGE-IPEA Census on the so-called third sector includes a field with deep interfaces with the areas of Physical Education and Recreation. The Culture and Recreation group comprises the subfields of Culture and Art (14,796, representing 4.4% of the total and 31.5% of the group in question) and Sports and Recreation (32,203 organizations, including 9.3% of total FASFILs and 68.5% of the group), totaling 46,999 FASFILs.

The description of the organizations that make up the subfields allows us to envisage this inclusion as places where various sports manifestations, body or leisure practices take place. The Culture and Art subgroup includes:

Cultural associations, artisans’ associations, samba schools, carnival groups, academies of letters, theaters, bands, choirs, folklore groups, museums, libraries, radios, philharmonic orchestras and gaucho tradition centers. This subgroup also includes: editing, printing and reproduction of recordings; film and video activities; radio and television activities; other artistic performances and activities (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008, p. 146).

This definition includes FASFILs that deal directly or indirectly with leisure, considering so-called artistic, intellectual, and social or cultural interests (MELO, ALVES JUNIOR, 2003). Despite their diversity, the activities that those organizations offer in their daily actions allow us to place them as participants of this leisure universe. Even those that offer services do so, since the products of their work return to the public as shows, radio, television, film, theater, circus programs, among other artistic possibilities.

In turn, the subfield of Sport and Recreation consists of:

Scouts groups and junior guards; recreational, sporting and athletic associations; employee associations focused on sports, leisure and recreation; several clubs focused on football, sports, karting, bicycle, camping, horse racing, jeeps, aero sports, etc; tourism associations in general. This subgroup also includes: interchange associations; yoga associations; sporting activities; and other leisure-related activities (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008, p. 147).

Based on this, it is possible to say that this universe includes not only recreational sports clubs but also the specific interest groups within body and/or sports activities. Many are fields of professional activity for graduates from Physical Education courses.

There was considerable growth in the number of organizations in 1996-2005 in several fields, in some cases with differences between subfields that comprise them. That is notorious among FASFILs of the Culture and Recreation field, which grew 169.8% in the period, less than the national average of 215.1%. However, there are huge internal disparities, with the subfield of Sport and Recreation having grown 132% in the period and Culture and Art seeing an amazing expansion of 317.6%.

With regard to regional distribution, in the Culture and Recreation field, 78.3% of the 46,999 FASFILs were located in the South and Southeast regions in 2005, when those regions were home to approximately 56.2% of Brazil's population. That concentration is even higher in the Sport and Recreation subsection. The regions mentioned above include 80% of the country's organizations in that item. Such concentration is not a surprise and is seen in some other fields such as health (76% of organizations), Education and Research (69.2%),¹ Housing (73.2%), Social services (75.2%), Religion (75.5%).

The Northern Region includes 1,487 organizations (3.16% of the field; 501 in Culture and Art and 986 in Sport and Recreation). In the Northeast, there are 6,348 organizations (13.5% of the field; 2,574 in Culture and Art and 3,774 in Sport and Recreation). The Southeast has 20,374 FASFILs (43.3% of field; 6,418 in Culture and Art and 13,956 in Sport and Recreation). On the other hand, there were 16,408 organizations in the South (34.9% of the field; 4,584 in Culture and Art and 11,824 in Sport and Recreation). The Midwest had 2,382 organizations (5% of the field; 719 in Culture and Art and 1,663 in Sport and Recreation).

As for the year of creation of organizations in the Culture and Recreation field, we can point to trends relevant to the debate. With 46,999 FASFILs in 2005, a low number of them (2,050 or 4.36% of total) was found before 1970, with 382 organizations of Culture and Art and 1,668 of Sport and Recreation. In the 1970s, 7,159 FASFILs were created (15.23% of the total field) – 1,167 organizations of Culture and Art and 5,992 of Sport and Recreation. In the following decade (the 1980s), 11,735 FASFILs emerged (24.96% of the field), being 2,685 in Culture and Art and 9,050 in Sport and Recreation; 15,819 FASFILs emerged in the 1990s (33.65% of the total) in this field, while 5,991 emerged in Culture and Art and 9,828 in Sport and Recreation. In the 2000s (until 2005), 10,236 organizations were created (21.77% of the total), including 2,571 in Culture and Art and 5,665 in Sport and Recreation. More than half of organizations (55.42%) emerged from the 1990s on, when the neoliberal project was being implemented in Brazil by the groups in power (Fernando Collor/PRN, Itamar Franco, Fernando Henrique Cardoso/PSDB, and Lula da Silva/PT).

¹ In the Higher Education subsection, the concentration rises to 74% of organizations in South and Southeast.

The distribution of workers in this field shows that the Sport and Recreation subfield has higher capillarity than Culture and Art. The whole Culture and Recreation field has 136,450 workers in its 46,999 organizations – about three workers per organization. Of this total, 95,134 workers (69.7% of the field and 5.7% of all FASFILs) work in organizations of the Sport and Recreation subfield. Culture and Art includes 41,316 workers – 30.3% of the field and 2.4% of employed people in general.

The next step will be the analysis of the distribution of workers regarding Brazilian regions in the field of Culture and Recreation in the 2005 IBGE-IPEA Census, noting that FASFILs in this field had 136,450 workers in 2005. The North region had 4,267 employees (3.12% of the total found in the field), of which 1,891 were in Culture and Art and 23,760 were in Sport and Recreation. The Northeast had 9,937 workers (7.28% of the total) in the Culture and Recreation field, of which 2,468 work in Culture and Art and 7,469 in Sport and Recreation. The Southeast region had 86,841 employees (63.64% of the total field) – 23,766 in Culture and Art and 63,075 in Sport and Recreation. In the South, Culture and Recreation FASFILs had 26,740 workers (19.59% of total), 9,459 of which worked in Culture and Art and 17,281 in Sport and Recreation. Finally, the Midwest Region had 8,665 workers (6.35% of the total) – 3,732 in Culture and Art and 4,933 in Sport and Recreation (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008, p. 36).

More than an absolute figure, the figures for the worker/organization average in each region will help to measure the size of the organizations in the Culture and Recreation field in 2005. Certainly, the average number of employees per organization will allow us to minimally infer the volume of resources handle by those organizations, since, unless there are problems only detectable on detailed analysis of each case, the number of employees is proportional to each organization's scope of activities. Note that large FASFILs might outsource some functions, implying a decrease in the number of its registered employees, despite the volume of resources they deal with.

The nationwide average of employees per organization is only 2.9 in the field of Culture and Recreation. In the Culture and Art subfield, the average is 2.8 while it is average is 3.0 employees per organization in Sport and Recreation. Regarding the regional division, a few specifics are worth noting.

The average number of employees/organization in the Culture and Recreation field in the North is 2.9, while the Culture and Art subfield's employee/organization average is 3.8, above the national average. In the Sport and Recreation subfield, the average is 2.4 employees per organization, below the national average in the subfield, which is 3.0 employees per organization.

The figure fell to 1.6 per employee per organization in the Northeast, below the national average (2.9). The Culture and Art subfield, with an average of 1.0 employee per organization, has a lower average than the national figure, with 2.8 employees per organization. In the Sport and Recreation subfield there is a sharp difference compared to the national average of employees per organization (3), with only two workers per FASFIL. That conveys strong impressions about tiny organizations in terms of the services they provide. Although they operate based on their founders' unpaid work, such a small number of employees means meager structure, probably without their own offices other than members' homes. The fact that they are young institutions contributes to that. In future census, we should monitor the staff/organization ratio in those regions (North and Northeast) to see whether or not it increases, which would indicate organizations' greater financial capacity.

In the Southeast, overall and per subfield averages of workers per organization under Culture and Art are higher than national, which has been a general trend in the FASFIL Census in that region. Organizations located in that region have an average of 4.3 employees each. The Culture and Art subfield has an average of 3.7 employees per organization, above the 2.8 national average. The Sport and Recreation subfield has an average of 4.5 employees per organization, over a national average of 3.0.

In the southern region, overall and per subfield averages within Culture and Art are lower than national ones. Organizations located in said region have an average of 1.6 employee each. The Culture and Art subfield has an average of 2.1 employees per organization, below the national average of 2.8. The Sport and Recreation subfield has an average of 1.5 employee per organization compared to a national average of 3.0.

In the Midwest, overall and per subfield averages within Culture and Recreation are higher than national ones. Organizations located in that region have an average of 3.6 employees each. The Culture and Art subfield has an average of 5.2 employees per organization, below the national average of 2.8. The Sport and Recreation subfield has an average of 3.0 employees per organization, equal to the national average. There is no separation by state, but the presence of the Federal District certainly tends to inflate the data, since the existence of a number of social clubs and cultural centers of several sorts, focused on civil servants, tends to raise these rates.

The 2005 Census shows an interesting situation regarding the average earnings of FASFIL workers. The 1,709,156 paid employees in 338,162 organizations received an average of 3.8 minimum wages per month – just above workers in general registered at the Ministry of Labor's CEMPRE in 2005 (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008, p. 43). In the Culture and Recreation field, workers' average pay is the same as nationwide, with 3.8 minimum wages. However, this conceals a deep imbalance between subfields that comprise that field. In Culture and Art, this figure rises to 5.7 minimum wages while it drops considerably to 3.0 wages per registered worker in Sport and Recreation. This shows that the few professional athletes in football, basketball and volleyball who receive high salaries either are not quantitatively significant to influence the average salary in this field to which employees registered in recreational clubs are certainly linked or their employment contracts with those clubs do not achieve high figures, and they establish labor relations as businesses corporations rather than workers. Nevertheless, the Culture and Recreation field seems to gather more educated workers in the several organizations that comprise it.

This situation changes when we add regional variations. Therefore, there is considerable difference regarding the average income of FASFIL workers by region. In the Culture and Recreation field, that variation ranges from 1.8 minimum wage in the Northeast to 4.0 in the Southeast and South, where workers earn more on average. The numbers found for the Culture and Art subfield show an even stronger difference. While in the Northeast workers in that subfield receive on average 2.3 minimum wages, those who work in the Southeast and South are paid 6.1 and 6.0 minimum wages respectively. In the Sport and Recreation subfield that gap is not so large since the minimum wage in the region with best pay (Southeast) reaches only 3.2 wages, while the lowest salary (Northeast) is 1.7 minimum wage ((INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008, p. 45). When we talk about workers in the Sport and Recreation field, and according to the definition of organizations that comprise it, we are dealing with a universe that includes teachers from different sports, athletes with some formal ties with

clubs, management staff of those organizations, among other variants. The fact that the average salary in the Northeast be 1.7 minimum wage reveals a terrible situation for workers in this field.

At the same time, we can also point out growth in terms of paid staff in that field, although limited. The Culture and Recreation field jumps from 109,395 FASFIL workers in 1996 to 119,692 in 2002 and 136,450 in 2005. More specifically, in the Culture and Art subfield, variation in the number of employees was 23,339 in 1996 to 31,670 in 2002 (35.7%) and 41,316 in 2005 (a considerable 30.5%, because it is a span of only three years compared to 2002). In turn, in the subfield Sport and Recreation, the variation of workers was minimal, from 86,056 in 1996 to 88,022 in 2002 (only 2.35%) and 95 134 in 2005 (jumping 8.1% over 2002).

Regarding the labor force employed at FASFILs in Brazil, the Census shows that there were 1,709,156 employees in 338,162 organizations in 2005 (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008, p. 24). Remarkably, more than half of those workers (57.1%) are found in Southeastern FASFILs, with 553,700 of them (32.4%) only in the state of São Paulo (p. 33). The fact that close to one third of the staff work in organizations in the most developed state from the urban industrial point of view shows the direct and clear relationship between the plurality of organizations and the degree of Westernization – meaning no a priori higher democratization of social relations. It is worth remembering Gramsci's definition of Western society as one in which there is socialization of political participation, through the expansion of the state and greater diversification of private apparatuses of hegemony of the various fractions of classes and/or social groups. Without being a geographical concept, the West/East dialectical pair seeks to show the impact of interests in social formations that experienced industrialization and urbanization on social relations between classes and forms of representation. It only indicates that civil society has become a mature arena for manifestation of central determinants of capitalist society and that political struggle focuses not only on the state apparatus (COUTINHO, 2006 NEVES, 2010).

At the same time, it is remarkable that 79.5% of organizations (268,887 of total 338,162) did not have any registered employee in 2005 (INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2008, p. 38). This indicates action based on the so-called volunteer work as well as the possibility of using scholarships and internships with secondary or university students without establishing regular ties with those subjects. In addition, 28,151 organizations (8.3%) have 1-2 employees, totaling only 37,823 workers or 2.2%. At the other end, only 487 organizations (0.1% of the total) have 500 or more employees. This small group of FASFILs totals 563,456 employees (33% of all workers in that field) Moreover, when we add the three groups with the most employees (50-99; 100-499; 500-plus registered workers), we find a staggering figure of 5,669 organizations or 1.6% of the total in the country in 2005, employing 1,252,040 FASFIL workers – 73.3% of all registered employees.

In the huge group of FASFILs with no paid worker (268,887 or 79.5% of the total), 37,240 organizations (amazingly, 11% of total FASFILs with no staff at all fields) are in the Culture and Recreation field. This indicates that, 79.2% of the 46,999 organizations in that field in Brazil in 2005 had no registered employee, which is very close to the national average. FASFILs in that field that have 1-2 registered employees are 4.375, representing 9.3% of Culture and Recreation organizations. Those that have ten to 49 employees, in turn, are 1,814 organizations in the field – almost 3.8% of FASFILs. In turn, 263 FASFILs had 50-99 employees in this field, corresponding to 0.55% of the total. Regarding the number of employees found in 2005 in the

Culture and Recreation field, only 218 FASFILs had 100-499 employees, equivalent to 0.46% of all organizations in the field. Finally, 17 FASFILs in this field had more than 500 employees – 0.03% of the total of Culture and Recreation organizations.

4 FINAL REMARKS

The increase in the number of FASFILs in Brazil is related to the expansion of opportunities for contracts with public agencies to provide several sorts of services. A boom in laws establishing management contracts, partnership contracts, agreements and other forms of relationship between non-profit private organizations (FASFILs) and public agencies attests to that fact (BRASIL, 2010). At the same time, it indicates the consolidation of the Westernization process of Brazilian society (COUTINHO, 2006), with the existence of a strong and vibrant civil society advocating multiple interests, without representing a priori democratic advancement.

Data on number of organizations, number of paid employees and average earnings confirm Brazil's deep regional inequalities. The gap between the South/Southeast and North/Northeast with respect to FASFILs follows the trend envisioned by Húngaro, Assis and Athayde's (2011) analysis of the 2002 FASFIL Census. Those differences show that these organizations behave according to conditions for maintaining their activities. This implies obtaining funding sources or selling their services. At the same time, it is undeniable that the close connection between expansion of possibilities for agreements and FASFILs' contracts with governments (and state-run companies such as Petrobras, through its agreements) causes their concentration to follow funding possibilities.

The huge volume of legally established organizations with no registered employee poses a major challenge to researchers. It is necessary – recognizing the immense difficulties – to establish empirical contact with some of those organizations in order to understand how they function, how they are maintained and what their daily activities are. What activities do they carry out? There are still many unanswered questions and they can only be addressed by further research. This shows that the effort to present Census data is a very important task, but one which must serve to stimulate new jobs.

Even in cases where there are positive results and the best intentions, as well as work committed to the target public, failure to constantly question the *raison d'être* of compensatory and salvationist programs while watching quietly – whether because of the organization's or individual employees' need for collective existence – contributions from donors and/or government members tends to imply complicity with the status quo. Again, that will not necessarily happen through compliance to the dominant project, but because of the need to keep existing. That is why the struggle for impersonal state action not tied directly to the group in power through career civil servants can be an important step – although it is certainly not enough – to confront the logic that establishes the new pedagogy of bourgeois hegemony. The analysis of FASFILs' impact on social life needs to include its political and economic role, which is inseparable from its concrete action. As large-scale employers of workforce, their impact on the huge contingent of the population that makes a living as employees of those organizations is undeniable.

REFERÊNCIAS

BRASIL. Presidência da República. Câmara de Reforma do Estado. **Plano diretor da reforma do aparelho do estado**. Brasília, 1995. Available at: <<http://www.bresserpereira.org.br/Documents/MARE/PlanoDiretor/planodiretor.pdf>>. Accessed on: January 11, 2004.

BRASIL. Ministério do Planejamento. Secretaria de Gestão. **Relações de parceria entre poder público e entes de cooperação e colaboração no Brasil**. Brasília, 2010. Available at: <http://www.gespublica.gov.br/projetos-acoas/pasta.2009-07-15.5584002076/Relacoes%20de%20parceria_a%20ser%20separada%20em%20capitulos.pdf>. Accessed on: March 14, 2013.

COUTINHO, Carlos Nelson. **Intervenções: o marxismo na batalha das ideias**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2006.

GARANHANI, Marynelma Camargo; EL TASSA, Khaled Omar Mohamad. Formação profissional para atuação em projetos sociais: no foco a formação de professores no “Programa Segundo Tempo”. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 19, no. 4, p. 273-287, Oct./Dec. 2013.

HECKTHEUER, Luiz Felipe Alcântara; SILVA, Méri Rosane Santos da. Projetos Sociais Esportivos: Vulnerabilização e Governo. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 17, no. 3, p. 115-132, Jul./Sep. 2011.

HÚNGARO, Edson; OLIVEIRA, Bruno; ATHAYDE, Pedro. O crescimento do Terceiro Setor no campo do esporte e lazer: apontamentos críticos. **Lecturas Educación Física y Deportes**, Buenos Aires, v. 15, p. 153, 2011.

INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA. **As Fundações privadas e Associações sem fins lucrativos no Brasil-2005**. 2. ed. Brasília, 2008.

MELO, Marcelo. **Esporte e dominação burguesa no século XXI: a agenda dos Organismos Internacionais e sua incidência nas políticas de esportes no Brasil de hoje**. PhD Thesis in Social Work – Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2011.

MELO, Victor; ALVES JUNIOR, Edmundo Drummond. **Introdução ao lazer**. São Paulo: Manole, 2003.

NEVES, Lúcia Maria W. (Ed.). **A direita para o social e esquerda para o capital: intelectuais da nova pedagogia da hegemonia no Brasil**. São Paulo: Xamã, 2010.

