

**MULTIDIMENSIONAL UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT:  
Theory and Practice on the Effective and Relevant Participation at UFT**

**Roberto Francisco de Carvalho**

*Doctor of Education by the Federal University of Goiás (UFG, BRAZIL). Associate Professor at the Federal University of Tocantins (UFT, BRAZIL)/ Campus of Palmas, Philosophy and Art-Drama Courses. Works as a researcher in the area of Educational Management, Curriculum and Policy, linked to the Praxis Oriented Group for Socioeducational and Cultural Study and Research.*

E-mail: [rcarvalho@uft.edu.br](mailto:rcarvalho@uft.edu.br)

**ABSTRACT**

*In this article, we aim to understand, by using the theoretical and empirical research and within the global context, the management and participation process in the social institutions such as the public Brazilian universities, as well as their link to the so called orientating neoliberal democracy of the neo-professional, heteronomous, competitive and operational university. Based on this we discuss the two main management concepts that contradictorily guide the administration of the federal Brazilian universities and, in a multidimensional perspective within the scope of the Federal University of Tocantins - UFT, how the participation by the segments of the university community takes effect.*

**Keywords:** *Democracy; Multidimensional Management; and Participation at the University/UFT*

**INTRODUCTION**

In this paper<sup>1</sup>, based on a theoretical and empirical study, we discuss participation and university management in a multidimensional perspective taking as empirical basis elements of management and the participation process in the Federal University of Tocantins (UFT). In this manner, it is aimed at highlighting strategic and management concepts, as well as democratic and participatory management concepts that contradictorily guide the administration of Brazilian federal universities, and in the process, explaining how participation of the segments of the university community become effective in a multidimensional perspective on the management development of UFT.

It is known that the theme of participation is current and has different meanings in the context of capitalist society in general, and especially of business organizations and social institutions, according to the implemented processes: manufacturing, social and political, and administrative, among others. Taking the case of the Brazilian public university, especially federal institutions of higher education (IFES), participation in general is part of the concerns of the university community. However, there are different meanings depending on the interests involved: managers, representatives, scientists, and researchers in the field.

Some studies have been addressing the problem of management and participation in university, and due to the nature of the educational work, have portrayed the theme of participation as an engagement technique dimension limited to the role that each segment of the university community plays. Other studies question the issue of participation as a manner of expanding the democratic process in society in general, and in particular in their institutions. Therefore, they advocate for an effective participation of the university community in the decision spaces and in general decision-making processes. This text is part of the tension between the possibility of expanding the participation of the themes related to the process of management and participation in multidimensional perspective within UFT.

Considering the upgrade process of the Brazilian State and its implications for democratization and participation in IFES, we conducted an investigation of theoretical and empirical nature, including bibliographic, documentary and field research covering the university community of UFT. In the specific case of participation and multidimensional management, before considering it as part of the UFT, we strived for theoretically

<sup>1</sup> This article was developed based on reflections of the thesis "*The management process and participation in the university: limits, possibilities and challenges in UFT.*" (CARVALHO, 2011)

detailing the discussion without losing sight of the two boundary lines of society in view of the interpenetration between public and private-market spheres (MÉSZÁROS, 2006). Not in a dichotomous way, these lines guide to education projects in dispute in Brazil in the public university, especially the IFES: a regulatory-nature project guided by strategic and business logic, and also a regulatory and emancipator-nature project driven by democratic and participatory logic.

### MANAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZATIONS IN GENERAL AND IN SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS SUCH AS UNIVERSITIES

The management of social processes in this society is not simple, since administrative activity is a complex social action that articulates objective and subjective elements. In this sense, men, when developing their work, tend to plan, execute and evaluate their activities. Historically, these activities have been carried out according to certain theoretical concepts, which can be summarized into *classic*, based on scientific management, which emphasizes the organizational structure and economic efficiency; *human relations*, guided by principles of Psychology that aims to behavioral consensus and adaptation; and *neoclassical*, which aggregates the characteristics of both mentioned theories, whose goal is to develop the work scheme from resources allocation and future prediction (SANDER, 1995).

In this process of understanding the educational reality within a broader view of knowledge and of the world, the education management analysis reminds us of studies that allow us to understand the historical development of administrative activity. In this regard, Sander (1995) mentions the existence of two traditional trends of administration: the functionalist, rooted in positivist and evolutionary theories; and interactional, which seeks to reflexively mediate social differences in a dialog perspective.

The functionalist tradition comprises the administrations of bureaucratic, idiosyncratic and integrator nature. In bureaucratic management, emphasis is given to the system at the expense of individual efficiency. On the grounds of legal approach, the institution complies with the laws and guiding regulations of the functionality of its members. In the idiosyncratic administration, the emphasis is on the individuals and is intricately linked to the behavioral approach. The main concern is the psychological character analysis of the behavior of individuals and institution. According to this individualistic-nature orientation, the concern is whether institutional effectiveness and pedagogical objectives do not overpass the requirements of efficient planning. In turn, integrating administration, which combines bureaucratic and idiosyncratic features, understand the educational institution as an open system, identifying either with the legal focus and the behavioral approach. (SANDER, 1995)

On the other hand, the interactionist tradition is subdivided into structuralist administration, interpretive administration and dialogical administration. According to Sander (1995), in structuralist administration the mediation is deterministic and emphasizes the institutional or objective dimension of organizational behavior. In this view, organization and management fully depend on the infrastructure conditions of an economic nature. In this sense, there is little attention to human action, and administrative emphasis revolves around the economic nature. In interpretive administration, the development of mediation occurs reflexively, emphasizing the individual or subjective dimension. Management and educational planning resulting from interpretive administration seek to overcome the dichotomies between intention and action, between theory and experience, between education and society, and finally, between the individual and their social environment.

Finally, in dialogical administration, mediation occurs dialectically and consists of a new way to plan, execute and evaluate the educational process because they are privileged dialogue and discussion. From this perspective, Sander states that:

[...] applied to education, dialogical administration is an analytical and praxeological perspective that emphasizes the totality of principles, practice and transformation of the educational system and its schools and universities. From the point of view of its intrinsic content, dialogical management is concerned with the phenomena of power and change, social inequalities and human emancipation [...]. From an analytical point of view [...] it uses dialectic as the scientific method and contradiction as its basic organizational phenomenon. (1995, p.100)

In this dimension, emancipation is acquired by means of praxis as a possibility of active intervention of the agents in the educational process. Dialogical management is intrinsically linked to the possibility of change. In this sense, acting in a dialectic manner, there is an overcoming by techno-bureaucracy aiming to decisively quit the split between those who think and those who execute.

From the above mentioned, we can infer the interpenetration of two perspectives of management<sup>2</sup>: the regulatory-strategic-business nature, based on the functionalist tradition to which bureaucratic control and the search for efficient production of economic perspective are intrinsic characteristics; and the regulatory and emancipatory-democratic participatory nature, based on the interactionist tradition, a perspective that strives for effective participation of agents that make up the segments of a particular social institution. Although acknowledging that regulation and emancipation are part of the same social reality, it has prevailed in the management of capitalist society in general, and in the management of Brazilian education in particular, the first perspective, considering that the possible administrative boundary is the co-management. The prospect of emancipatory management which requires the self-management of human autonomy, remains a challenge for the society and for individuals participating in social institutions such as education.

Therefore, to consider the participation in the public university management process requires the comprehension of contradictions and conflicts between the perspectives of regulation of strategic-business nature and the emancipation of democratic-participatory nature that are part of the same educational reality. It is clear that management in an emancipatory perspective does not exclude the need for regulation, but we understand that the more prominent is the prospect of the strategic-business-nature regulatory regulation in a management process, the more limited the effective participation of subjects which compound the university community will be.

Given the perspective of strategic and business regulation, it is clear that the effective participation is limited in fact, since the amounts related to competitiveness, individual effort and productivity prevail over power sharing perspective in a given community. In contrast or contradiction with the prospect of regulation, but not in a mechanistic way, the prospect of democratic emancipation constitutes, in this sense, in the conception of university in which political dimension and participation is more evident and important. (CONTERA, 2002)

We emphasize that the prospects for strategic-business-democratic and participatory regulation are part of the same contradictory social totality. The effort for the characterization of these two perspectives of management has a didactic function whose purpose is to outline the perspective which tends to be most favorable to the effective participation. Thus, established this tensioned differentiation between the perspective of the strategic-business nature regulation and the emancipation of democratic-participatory nature of the university educational process, and the latter pointed as more conducive to effective participation of the subjects that form the university community, we cannot forget that especially since 1990 Brazilian public university has adopted a regulatory-regulation perspective of strategic-business nature, thus less emancipatory in its formative process.

This is a social regulation perspective of neo-professional, heteronomous, competitive, operational nature – which conducts an economic-production one-sided perspective of society whose expression is the market neoliberalism and the process of globalization of capital – (CONTERA, 2002; SGUISSARDI, 2004; CHAÚÍ, 1999); also pragmatic and conformist in the social order established by an elitist, coopt, absorbent, and managerial process (MÉSZÁROS, 2008) that articulates the fragmentation and homogenization of the production of tangible and intangible goods, which hinders the development of a critical conscience and a defiant, transformative, and emancipator participation. (CHAÚÍ 2001)

In this manner, university management in higher education should be envisioned as an inserted action in the field of politics and economics as a social practice endowed with relative autonomy (DOURADO, 2000). Therefore, a management that glimpse participation in democratic perspective aiming at considering the existing power structures within the social relations which educational practices are performed needs to go beyond and

---

<sup>2</sup> In the emancipatory management perspective the regulation of social processes is not eliminated, but such procedure is not intended to exacerbate the regulatory process through the creation of alienating bureaucratic obstacles of subsumption of the man to the determined productivist logic at the expense of the autonomous human achievement and in a more emancipatory perspective. Regulation, in general, has to do with how social processes set up to certain purposes translated in the form of predefined rules and standards. The regulation is a particular mode of regulation and rules in this case are fixed in the form of procedures often with a value in itself independent of the uses that are made of them. Regulation in this case is presented as a dimension of regulation, that under the power of an authority aims to control and influence decisions through the introduction of various rules and standards. In regulation in an emancipatory perspective - that does not exclude the regulation - the joint production of the guiding rules of a particular social process occurs due to the actions set in motion through several strategies and social actors seeking a common goal. (BARROSO, 2005)

process counter-hegemonic management and education, then acting, by contradiction, within the hegemonic education project. In this case, it is not an automatic denial of education today, but of its intense and ongoing transformation.

In this direction, in a Gramscian perspective, given the possibility of adoption of the "war of position"<sup>3</sup>, considering the possibility of adoption of the "war of position", and having in mind the importance of the "war of movement", it seems feasible to pursue a management in which it shares the power of decision – co-management according to Motta (1984) in his studies about the social organizations of the productive sector – is a possible way of managing current society, although underachieved. To exercise it would set in motion the ultimate form of participation in the current educational organization to promote some kind of contrast to the hetero-management process in effect today. Sander (1995) proposes a multidimensional management articulating the economic, educational, political, and cultural dimensions in educational institutions such as universities.

In accordance with Sander, it is possible to outline four conceptual and praxeological constructions of educational management, namely: efficient management, effective governance, effective management, and relevant administration, which respectively correspond to four performance criteria or approaches: efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, and relevance. Given these concepts, according to Sander (1995), the schools and university's management has historically responded to multiple orientations, thus assuming different perspectives that, methodologically, point to the existence of three possible theoretical and practical realization of the administration of education.

The first one conceives the four conceptual and praxeological constructions of education management as exclusionary alternatives, in which they occur in isolation and with no interdependence of others. Thus, "the choice of one of several paths is made based on perceptions and interpretations of educational reality and administrative phenomena by citizens who participate in the educational system." (SANDER, 1995, p. 54)

The second differs from the previous one by relying on the idea that the different paradigms are not mutually exclusionary, but it can be, in coordination, used to address the demands of the educational institution on a multi-paradigmatic management perspective.

The third possible approach, the multidimensional paradigm of education, considers the confluences and contradictions among the four education administration buildings; a totalizing vision of educational reality in the context of broader social practices that articulate the criteria of efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, and relevance. In line with this, "the administration is conceived as a global phenomenon with multiple analytical and praxeological orientations or dimensions." (SANDER, 1995, p. 55)

Thus, in a dialectical perspective, multidimensional management covers the four dimensions previously mentioned: economic, educational, political, and cultural. The economic dimension is associated with the principles of organization and management developed in the early twentieth century, in the context of consolidation of the Second Industrial Revolution, among which are economic rationality and human productivity. At this orientation, "administration anticipates and controls resources, structurally organizes the institution, establishes roles and positions, divides the work, determines how the work should be done and by which type of incumbents, and establishes norms of action." (SANDER, 1995, p. 59) The defining criterion of the economic dimension is the efficiency linked to the rational and utilitarian logic of capitalist enterprise and, in this sense, aims at the competent technical training of its employees and maximizing the uptake and utilization of its financial and technological resources.

Reacting to the widespread emphasis on economic logic on education, it is developed the pedagogical dimension, which, under the scrutiny of multidimensionality, attaches to the administrative process the function of "coordinating the creation and use of content, spaces, methods and techniques to preserve the purposes and objectives of education in their efforts to fulfill their economic, political, and cultural role." (SANDER, 1995, p. 61) This refers, therefore, to "the set of principles, scenarios and educational techniques intrinsically

---

<sup>3</sup> Politically, the "war of movement" refers to the taking of the radical and front formal power by means of conquering political society or political-administrative apparatus. The "war of position", in turn, is the strategic conquest of power by forming consensus within civil society as a starting point for the hegemonic construction under the expanded state. (COUTINHO, 2007)

compromised with the effective achievement of the objectives of the educational system" (SANDER, 1995, p. 60). In other words, it uses the efficiency as a criterion of administrative performance to the achievement of institutional goals, defining aspect of the specificity of educational management.

According to Sander, the other perspective to be stated concerns the political dimension, which has a close connection with the educational, economic and cultural context in which the institution operates. When considering the multiplicity of elements that interfere with the achievement of pedagogical action, it values the effective exercise of its social function, aimed at meeting the needs and demands of its agents. Effectiveness is the founding criterion of management dimension, that is, it appreciates for an effective participation in decision-making in the educational institutions.

Articulated to the previous dimension, there is the cultural dimension - related to the criterion of relevance - whose basic assumption is the overall view of reality historically constructed by all men in society. In this case, the administration of education is founded on the coordination of actions "of people and groups who directly or indirectly participate in the educational process [...] in order to [...] establish conditions for the full performance of the human as subject" (SANDER, 1995, p. 65-66), seeking to add evaluative sense and meaning to the human development also by means of the school educational process.

Thus, based on the multidimensional paradigm of education, we can estimate, according to Sander (1995, p. 55-56.), that management is based on four basic assumptions:

First, education and administration are conceived as global realities that, for analytical purposes, can be constructed by multiple dimensions dialectically articulated with each other. Second, in the education system there are substantive or ideological concerns, cultural and political nature, and instrumental or technical concerns, teaching and economic nature. Third, in the education system there are internal concerns of an anthropological and pedagogical character, and external concerns about the economy and the wider society. Fourth, the human being as an individual and social subject is historically responsible for building the society and its organizations in a number of historic opportunities, constitutes the reason for the existence of the educational system.

With this explanation of the different dimensions of the multidimensional paradigm of educational administration, it can be argued, following the reasoning of Sander (1995), the need to adopt it, with a view to overcoming individualistic and functionalist positions, usually developed in schools and universities. Such behaviors – as opposed to the prospect of a multidimensional management – detach the different levels or dimensions of global reality as if they existed independently.

In this manner, in a multidimensional perspective, management plays a mediation role in the educational institutions in order to drastically articulate the economic, educational, effective, and relevant dimension. In this logic, "efficiency is subsumed by effectiveness; effectiveness and efficiency are subsumed for responsiveness; and efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness are subsumed by relevance." (SANDER, 1995, p. 67). Therefore, there is the recovery of the correct value of each of the dimensions of the management process from the perspective of unity, alienation, and autonomy. In the words of Sander (1995, p. 67),

[...] It is important to recover the correct value of economic efficiency in administrative decisions related to the effective achievement of educational goals. Similarly, it is necessary to redefine the role of efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of education concerned with the quality and cultural relevance of education and the attainment of its political objectives.

Although it may be glimpsed the possibility of implementation of multidimensional management which, in principle, could broaden the public sphere, democracy and effective participation have been occurring in the educational setting, strengthening the design of regulatory-regulation management and strategic-managing-nature, based on fragmented and verticalized relations, whose logic is based on rationalization, administrative efficiency and a functional participation, largely protected and sustained by an individualistic culture (CONTERA, 2002; and CATANI; OLIVEIRA; DOURADO, 2004).

However, assuming the implementation of a democratic perspective in management at universities, we understand that one of the challenges posed to the contemporary scenario is to guide our practices by multidimensional perspective of management (SANDER, 1995), which makes explicit the effective

participation in search of the embodiment of possible management in today's society, co-management (MOTTA, 1984), but without losing sight of the search for self-management of social institutions in general, and in the case of this study, university educational institutions especially.

### **MANAGEMENT OF UFT: evidence of the effectiveness of the instrumental dimension of participation within the university community**

In general, taking as parameter the priorities listed in the study on which the present text is based,<sup>4</sup> it is possible to say that in the UFT management process, in the perception of teachers, there is a participation with more effective traits and, in the perception of students and technical and administrative staff in education (TAE), a more operational participation, in the same direction, in a bias, it was indicated as priorities in the UFT management process meetings of Consuni (University Council) and Consepe (Council of Education, Research, and Extension) and two campuses of Councils Boards. In this respect, under these councils, the 220 guidelines that were discussed and resolved include, in most cases, the dimensions called instrumental by Sander (1995), involving mainly the economic and administrative aspects (66%) and educational and scientific (25%). The substantive dimensions rank last, involving a small percentage of guidelines (9%) related to political and cultural aspects. (CARVALHO, 2011)

As for the collegiate of courses, the debate of the guidelines remains. Out of 1,456 guidelines points discussed and resolved in 335 meetings of 21 undergraduate courses, covering the seven campuses of the UFT, the majority (93%) of the guidelines is on the dimensions that Sander called instrumental: economic and administrative (60%) and educational and scientific (33%). Likewise, all the three Councils, the minority of guidelines (7%) is "directly related" to the substantive dimensions, that is, political and cultural aspects of the UFT.

As for the term "directly related", we would like to explain that, although we have made a rating to make the analysis easier, we are convinced that this classification does not meet some materiality widely coincident with the empirical reality. In other words, in a discussion about a guideline point of an educational and scientific dimension, economic and administrative and political and cultural dimensions can be articulated, and vice versa. (CARVALHO, 2011)

In the same direction of the priorities mentioned above, in the perception of the research subjects, the data set make it possible to say, based on Sander (1995), that there is a bias in the process of management of the UFT to discuss and decide about the points of the guidelines related to economic and administrative aspects – which involve financial and material resources, structures, bureaucratic rules and coordination and communication mechanisms – and educational and scientific resources, referring to the set of principles, scenarios and educational techniques, more than policies points which include strategies of organized action by the participants in the educational and cultural system, involving the values and philosophical, anthropological, biopsychic, and social characteristics.

From this perspective, although we may have as a guidance and utopia the participation and democratic and participative management of multidimensional nature, also articulator of efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, and social and educational relevance, which has been effected is a guided strategic and managerial management, in large extent, by the efficiency of economic and commercial nature. It does not seem to be a management perspective to mobilize the participation of the university community or even in formal spaces of deliberation, especially students and technical and administrative staff.

There are certainly several points that restrict the participation, and that involve material, institutional, political, ideological and communication aspects. In the case of participation, especially students and technicians, this may be related to the non-numeric completion of deliberative spaces as Consuni, Consepe, Council Board of Campi and Colleges courses. In this regard, the survey data show that in higher councils, such as Consuni and Consepe, the presence of representatives of the three segments of the university community in ten meetings

---

<sup>4</sup> We emphasize that in the field research it was used as research technique the questionnaire for teachers, students and technical and administrative staff in education (TAE), as well as systematic observation by the university Council, the Council of Education, Research and Extension and the Council Board. "From the sample selected for the research, totaling 1,372 subjects (with 319 teachers, 750 students and 303 TAE) the study sums a total of 812 (59%) of the subjects selected. Participants who answered the questionnaires were distributed as follows: 149 (47%) teachers, 504 (67%) and 159 students (52%) TAE." (CARVALHO, 2011, p. 235)

ranged from 60% and 100%. It is highlighted the fact that, in the four surveyed councils, out of the possible student counselors, 36% attended the meetings, which is a low percentage when compared with the presence of managers counselors (84%), representatives of teachers (88%), and representatives of TAE (92%). (CARVALHO, 2011)

Following the above reasoning, the study tried to identify the presence of counselors representing the segments of the university community in the collegiate courses. The research source was the minutes of 21 UFT graduation courses in 2007 under the boards of these courses. 335 meetings were held, and it was expected to participate, as counselors, 4,352 teachers, 692 students and 78 TAE. (CARVALHO, 2011)

We point out we found records of participation of TAE in only two of the 21 surveyed courses, that is, in the other 19 college courses, following the precepts of the general regulations of the UFT, the technicians were not included as counselors. In the two boards in which the TAE had the opportunity to participate as counselors, the total attendance at meetings amounted 33%.

After explained this particular representation of TAE counselors, we draw attention to the fact that teachers and students mostly compose the collegiate courses in UFT. Out of all 4,352 teachers expected to participate as counselors in the collegiate, 69% attended the meetings. Analyzing the records found in the minutes, it was found that the participation of students as counselors is also numerically low (31%) compared to the quantity of students who could participate in the meetings of collegiate courses. It is important to note that the 335 meetings that students could participate as advisors, 173 (52%) did not attend them. Another feature on the student segment worth mentioning relates to the rarity of records manifestations of students at the board meetings, suggesting that although they are present, student counselors do not effectively participate in these. (CARVALHO, 2011)

Data referring to the participation in the councils and boards reveal a paradox of participation in the UFT management process. On the one hand, there is a demand for decision-making processes in the various participatory spaces and, on the other hand, there is a low participation in public spaces in important activities or actions taking place at the university, especially with regard to the level of the proposition and development of guidelines and planning. There is a demand for greater participation, but not even the existing participation spaces have been filled, particularly by students and TAE.

### **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The trend that the UFT has been following in the development of its policies, focusing its efforts more in addressing the support activities of the institution than in core activities, needs to be analyzed by being aware of the contradictory dialectic with its several implications in the light of production process of the Brazilian public university in general, assigned by what Chauí (1999) called operational university, and which certainly has to do with what Sguissardi and Silva Jr. (2009) call instability process and work intensification process in the IFES, operated by an approach of management, strategic and business nature, empowering the private-market sphere as discussed in this article.

In principle, according to the study in question, there is a tendency in the UFT management process of evidencing instrumental dimensions that prioritize the means and placing in second the substantive dimensions aimed at education. This perspective of management may reveal that aspects related to effective participation do not arise as an institutional feature fundamentally highlighted. It does not mean that there was no participation in the institution, but that this participation occurs at the level of executions of actions, thus placing in second the levels in policy and institutional guidelines, planning and evaluation.

This trend of interest relates to a number of different factors and, in the case of UFT, may have to do, among others, with the fact that the university is in a consolidation phase, yet creating conditions to make participation effective; the competitive and market determinations resulting from the changes taking place in the State and its effects on higher education, particularly with regard to the instability and intensification of work; and, as a result of such determinations, the strategic business-management perspective adopted, which significantly affects political participation that has consequences for institutional purposes.

As stated above, the perception of the subjects of the University about the UFT management process reveals that participation, especially by students and TAE, finds it difficult to perform effectively. The survey data show that the failure to carry out an effective participation has multiple explanations, covering, among others, the frame of

the organizational structure of the institution, the relevance of this type of participation in the management model adopted by senior management, and the inconsistency of the representation process within the university.

The data also reveal that the organizational structure of the UFT, in the form of councils and collegiate, does not solve by itself the problem of participation in the university community. There are difficulties with regard to participation by means of representation in decision-making spaces, besides the fact that the participation of the majority of the community basically occurs at the level of implementation tasks, in contrast to the level of preparation, evaluation, and monitoring.

This perspective does not guarantee the effective decentralization of decision-making power for the entire university community, especially for students and the TAE segment, but only the decentralization of debatable points and the implementation of technical and administrative, and pedagogical and scientific tasks. This kind of participation can hinder the social control of the University about the general actions developed at the university, and especially on the specific management practices of the group of people who, at one point, take the administrative power in the institution.

In this perspective, the struggle for power within the university is at stake, and the effectiveness of its participation or its restriction consists of a strategy for maintaining or not the power. The increasing or decreasing of the participation and of the democracy in the true sense is related to the project of society, as well as education and management. The social project is routed according to its struggles and, therefore, it is classist. It affects on the routes followed by society: on the expansion of the perspective of the public sphere, the common good and the general interest of society, and in view of the private-market sphere, the particular good and interest of individuals. The education project and the University cannot do without this general design and relates to a process of management which results from the tension between the strategic-business-democratic and participatory perspective. The struggle for expanding the public sphere, democracy and democratic participative management implies a struggle of the university community for effective participation also in the IFES, such the case of the UFT.

The contradiction in the process of participation is certainly related to barriers to participation in society in its broadest sense, which have, in the logic of neo-professional, heteronomous, competitive (SGUISSARDI, 2004) and operating university (CHAUÍ, 1999), which hinders the participation in institutional management process. Such logic is directly related to the process of expansion of private-market sphere and representative, liberal/neo-liberal democracy (GRAMSCI, 1978; MÉSZÁROS, 2004) also of minimalist bias within the IFES, particularly the UFT, which is consistent with a view to strategic and business management in which there is a subordinate and limiting participation. (CONTERA, 2002; CATANI; OLIVEIRA; DOURADO, 2004).

This perspective is surely distant from a multidimensional management which justifies its actions in an educational logic that dialectically submits the dimensions of instrumental nature – economic, administrative and teaching – to the substantive dimension: political and cultural. We shall continue to rescue the correct values of the university management process by the subsumption of instrumental criteria – institutional efficiency and effectiveness – to the substantive criteria: political and cultural relevance and effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

- BARROSO, João. O Estado, a educação e a regulação das políticas públicas. *Educação e Sociedade*, Campinas/SP, v. 26, nº 92, p. 725-751, especial, out, 2005.
- CARVALHO, Roberto Francisco de. *O processo de gestão e participação na universidade: limites, possibilidades e desafios na UFT*. 2011. 350 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) - Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, 2011.
- CONTERA, Cristina. Modelos de avaliação da qualidade da educação superior. In.: SOBRINHO, José Dias e RISTOFF, Dilvo I (Org.). *Avaliação democrática: para uma universidade cidadã*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2002, p. 119-144.
- COUTINHO, Carlos Nelson. *Gramsci: um estudo sobre o seu pensamento político*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2007.
- CATANI, Afrânio Mendes; OLIVEIRA, João Ferreira de; DOURADO, Luiz Fernandes. As políticas de gestão e de avaliação acadêmica no contexto da reforma de educação superior. In: MANCIBO, Deise e FÁVERO, Maria de Lourdes Albuquerque. *Universidade: políticas, avaliação e trabalho docente*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2004. p. 251-262.
- CHAUÍ, Marilena de Souza. A Universidade Operacional. *Folha de São Paulo*, p. 3, de 9 de maio de 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Escritos sobre a universidade*. São Paulo: UNESP, 2001.

- DOURADO, Luiz Fernandes. O público e o privado na agenda educacional brasileira. In: FERREIRA, Naura Syria Carapeto; AGUIAR, Márcia Ângela da S. (Coord.). *Gestão da educação: impasses, perspectivas e compromissos*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000.
- GRAMSCI, Antonio. *Maquiavel, a política e o estado moderno*. 3.ed. Trad.: Luiz Mário Gazaneo. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1978.
- MÉSZÁROS, István. *O poder da ideologia*. Trad.: Paulo Cezar Castanheira. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Para além do capital*. Trad.: Paulo Cezar Castanheira e Sérgio Lessa. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Educação para além do capital*. Trad. Isa Tavares. 2.ed. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.
- MOTTA, Fernando C. Prestes. *Participação e co-gestão: novas formas de administração*. 2.ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1984.
- SANDER, Benno. *Gestão da educação na América Latina: construção e reconstrução do conhecimento*. Campinas: Autores Associados, 1995.
- SGUISSARDI, Valdemar. A universidade neoprofissional, heterônoma e competitiva. In.: MANCEBO, Deise; FÁVERO, Maria de Lourdes Albuquerque. *Universidade: políticas, avaliação e trabalho docente*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2004. p. 33-52.