

# THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIO-PRODUCTIVE IN FAMILY FARMING ASSOCIATIONS IN THE AMAZONICA REGION

Received on: 11/10/2018

Approved on: 01/11/2018

Dr. Cristiano Descovi Schimith<sup>1</sup>  
João Victor Reis Alves<sup>2</sup>  
Roberta Carolina Salgado Fonseca<sup>3</sup>

## ABSTRACT

The family farming features the management of shared resources, the source of income, productive diversity, workplaces and farmers dwellings, thus develop socio-productive bring progress for the economy, mainly by promoting entrepreneurship among the associations. Therefore, this research aims to analyze the panorama of associations of family agriculture in the municipalities of Abaetetuba, Ananindeua, Barcarena, Belém and Santa Izabel, in order to identify demands and propose socio-productive actions management and accounting, promoting the development of Social Entrepreneurship in the Amazon region. To this end, a research Participant of qualitative and exploratory objective to identify the local demands of the associations surveyed was carried out. The results show that when identifying the demands and consequently perform the socio-productive actions, the members showed more participatives, developing entrepreneurial actions, have improved the deal and the responsibility of the financial budget familiar, presented more interest in developing entrepreneurial actions among the joins that consequently qualified for obtaining public calls, thus contributing to local sustainable development.

**Keywords:** Family Farming; Accounting; Social Entrepreneurship; Sustainability; Amazon.

---

1 Graduated in business administration with emphasis in foreign trade, Ph.d. in industrial engineering and systems. Professor of Accounting at the Federal University of Pará – UFPA/FACICON. Belém-PA. Brazil. E-mail: cristiano.schimith@gmail.com

2 College student of Accounting at the Federal University of Pará – UFPA/FACICON. Belém-PA. Brazil. E-mail: joaoralves@outlook.com

3 College student of Accounting at the Federal University of Pará – UFPA/FACICON. Belém-PA. Brazil. E-mail: roberta.fonseca.s18@gmail.com

# 1 INTRODUCTION

About 90% of total rural establishments in the world are classified as Family Farming (FF) (FAO, 2014). They are fundamental characteristics of FF shared family management, workplace, dwelling house, source of income and productive diversity, being that, all these are aligned with the intrinsic dependence on land.

In Brazil, FF represents 36.11% of the national production of food (GUANZIROLI; DI SABBATO, 2014), being relevant and determinant when it comes to foods that arrives to the table of Brazilians, this puts the family farmer in a prominent role regarding the production chain responsible for the country's supply (GOMES, 2008).

According Hurlienne (2005), contrary to idea of backwardness and misery associated to family farming, this socio-productive system has been highlighted in an agro-ecological and socio-environmentally sustainable way. Data show that family farming represents 84.40% of the total rural establishments in the country and employs 74.40% of agriculture sector's manpower (IBGE, 2009).

Despite the importance of family farming and representativeness in the generation of employment and income, this sector was neglected in the formulation of public policies until the end of the 20th century, when, with the emergence of National Programme for Strengthening Family Farming (*Programa Nacional de Fortalecimento da Agricultura Familiar – PRONAF*) in 1996, the family farmers had been able to have public incentive (SILVA, 2012).

Another recent advance was the institutionalization of FF through Law nº 11.326/2006, that establishes the guidelines for formulation of National Policy on Family Farming and Rural Family Enterprises (*Política Nacional da Agricultura Familiar e Empreendimentos Familiares Rurais*). Recognizing the importance of this sector, other initiatives are instituted with articulation of public policies for the strengthening of FF through institutional food market programs, as National School Feeding Program (*Programa Nacional de Alimentação Escolar – PNAE*) and Food Acquisition Program (*Programa de Aquisição de Alimentos – PAA*) (SARAIVA et al., 2013).

Despite advances with regard to public policies directed on family farming in recent years, many challenges remain to be faced, such as the social organization of farmers, productive management and markets access (DE PAULA; KAMIMURA; SILVA, 2014). In addition, the establishment management and decision making happen in an unstructured way and based on common sense of producers (LOURENZANI et al., 2008). Since few have professional qualification, as points out the 2006 Agricultural Census (IBGE, 2009).

Based on the contrast between socioeconomic importance and the challenges of family farming, this research started from the following questioning: What are the management and accounting demands for family farming associations in the Amazon region? For this, it sought to analyze the scenario of family farming associations in the municipalities of Abaetetuba, Ananindeua, Barcarena, Belém and Santa Izabel, in order to propose solutions as courses and lectures on management and accounting for the development of socio-productive actions and Social Entrepreneurship in the Amazon region.

Therefore, an exploratory and qualitative research was carried out with the application of a semi-structured instrument which was submitted to the members of the associations. The collected content was analyzed by the technique of content analysis. The identified demands were directed to the directors of the association who requested courses to meet the identified needs.

This research is presented by an introduction that now ends, a theoretical framework which addresses the following themes: social entrepreneurship, management in family farming and socio-productive actions, the methodology, which details the procedures adopted to achieve

the results, analysis of results that presents the content analysis performed and the final considerations that present the main findings of the research, also presenting the limitations and directing the reader for future research.

## 2 THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

### 2.1 Social Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is associated with the start of a new business (LANG; FINK, 2018), however, the concept has expanded and created other strands, such as social entrepreneurship (DWIVEDI; WEERAWARDENA, 2018). It is a field that aims to understand the business and the market not only with the prospect of profit, but with the potential to promote the reduction of social inequalities (CAMPELLI et al., 2011).

Social entrepreneurship promotes actions of local impact (DWIVEDI; WEERAWARDENA, 2018), in view of the collective result, capable of promoting social, economic and community development (MACKE et al., 2018; OLIVEIRA, 2004). Business of social purposes such as associations, cooperatives, informal groups and self-managing companies can be considered social enterprises (GODÓI-DE-SOUSA; GANDOLFI, P.; GANDOLFI, M., 2011).

In Brazil, this theme (Social Entrepreneurship) emerges from the 90's (NEVES; GUEDES; DOS SANTOS, 2010; OLIVEIRA, 2004), in consequence of the growing social problematization, reduction of public investments in the social field, growth of third sector organizations and initiatives aimed at social investments promoted by companies (MACKE et al., 2018).

In the last decade, entrepreneurship has been emerging and impelling new forms of social and human development, based on new paradigms of action, which start from the yearnings and demands of the community bases (MACKE et al., 2018; MELO NETO; FROES 2002), promoting debates to become sustainable the incremental social and improve well-being in private resource environments (JIAO, 2011).

So it is possible to unify social entrepreneurship to the creation of social value, which comprises the unmet needs of private resource communities, with a focus on social innovation (DI DOMENICO; TRACEY; HAUGH 2010). It is a collective action to integrate social development. Through these actions, try to solve the problems of communities producing goods and services for the same (ROTHAERMEL; AGUNG; JIANG, 2007).

The focus of seeking solutions to social problems it is the responsibility of the social entrepreneur who, through the needs identified in the community, proposes actions to promote change in the environment (BIKSE; RIVZA; RIEMERE, 2015). At this step, the process that measures the operation of your actions is measured through performance, that are the behavioral attitudes of individuals and the number of people reached with the project (MELO NETO; FRÓES, 2002).

For Dolabela (2008), the social entrepreneur is someone who believes that he can contribute, and with acts aims to change reality, even though he is new in his current configuration, which stems from its leadership and innovation capabilities. The social entrepreneur is a special kind of leader, because their ideas and innovations, rather than being applied to a product or service, are used to search for solutions to community problems (MELO NETO; FROES, 2002).

Social Entrepreneurs are individuals with the capacity to create innovative solutions to social problems using tools of traditional entrepreneurship (business) to create, lead and manage organizations capable of impacting on the routine of people (BIKSE; RIVZA; RIEMERE, 2015). The growing process of social exclusion, that is identified in the world, aggravated by the recent global

economic crises, evidenced and chancelled by the incapacity of the public power to articulate public policies, are factors driving the emergence and growth of third sector organizations and the concept and practice of Social Entrepreneurship (FISCHER, 2002; OLIVEIRA, 2004).

A strategy to circumvent the difficulties inherent in agricultural activity is joining with other producers to form associations in order to be competitive in the marketplace. Thus it is possible to identify in family farming associations, profiles of social entrepreneurs who work for the benefit of the association, promoting change in the routine activities of the people involved in the project (LANG; FINK, 2018).

## **2.2 Management in family farming**

Family farming is an activity passed from generation to generation, in which the succession represents the continuity of the familiar rural establishment (CHISWELL, 2018). In order to be successful it is necessary that the rural establishment be administered as a company adopting criteria and management attributes (SILVA, 2017).

In general, the farming families are managed by the “heads” of families, who create and organize a system of labor relations (BRANDÃO, 1993) based on the characteristics of family composition (CHAYANOV, 1974).

However, there is a lack of managerial techniques in the activities of family farming, as a lack of planning, lack of control in financial management, mainly in terms of expenses and productive costs (LOURENZANI et al., 2008).

For Frühauf (2014), one of the main problems in the financial management of family agriculture is the indistinction between the personal expenses of the families and the expenses of the agricultural activity. Silva (2017) affirms that it is essential to systematically record the accounting information, even for small rural establishments.

The lack of financial information regarding the productive activity makes it impossible to analyze costs and evaluate the performance of production (LOURENZANI; SOUZA FILHO, 2009). Therefore, the management of indicators should be planned with a view to the desired return and the demands of the consumer market. In this sense, information technologies, mainly in the generation and control of management indicators, are essential to generate indicators necessary for decision-making by the administration of family farming establishments (FERRAZ; PINTO, 2017; SILVA, 2017). However, this reality does not contemplate the characteristics of family farming, given the existence of the disconnect between the skills of this public and these Technologies (DEPONTI, 2014).

As reported by Lourenzani et al. (2008), that the management of the rural establishment and the decision making take place in an unstructured way and based on the common sense of producers, being one of the main factors the lack of professional qualification, which, according to IBGE (2009) is relatively high in family farming.

The profitability of agricultural activities is no longer concentrated in the field of agricultural techniques. In the current scenario, marked by market competitiveness, management in family agriculture is highlighted (SILVA, 2017). Being necessary the professionalization of the family management, with commercial focus (SIMIONI; BINOTTO; BATTISTON, 2015).

Due to the expansion of supermarket chains, the market for this sector is increasingly competitive, increasing requirements for standardization, regular supply and quality, family farming (ROCHA JUNIOR; CABRAL, 2016). In the search for alternatives farmers have organized themselves as associations and cooperatives, in order to become competitive in the face of current market demands (LIMA; VARGAS, 2015).

For Silva e Schultz (2017), although these entities are derived from the resistance to the precepts of the capitalist market economy, it is necessary for the associations and cooperatives to adjust to them, especially in more conventional environments, in which the high degree of competitiveness makes economically unfeasible the cooperative organizations, as is the case of agriculture.

An alternative to this is to promote socio-productive to insert the production units of family farming in the associative agribusiness Market, allowing the reduction of intermediaries and losses due to lack of flow and, thus, better prices due to the aggregation of value to the products (ROCHA JUNIOR; CABRAL, 2016). But for this, Silva (2017) emphasizes the importance of training of farmers.

### **2.3 Socio-productive Actions in Family farming**

The scope of socio-productive actions can be understood as acts whose impacts reflect on the social and productive structure of a particular environment. For Junqueira (2015), socio-productive organizations, such as family farmer associations and cooperatives, have a high potential to promote social and economic transformations in the countryside.

According to Schneider (2016), family farming has featured role in overcoming poverty, the generation of jobs and income, food security and sustainable rural development. In this sense, the socio-productive actions of family agriculture are effective in the struggle of these four socio economic problems.

For Silva (2011) the poverty in the countryside comes mainly from the concentration of wealth and territorial spaces, represented by latifundiary properties. According to FAO (2015), family farming has the capacity to contribute effectively to poverty reduction, since family farmers have an active and strategic role in transforming rural area (SCHNEIDER, 2016). For this, it is necessary that family agriculture be in constant process of innovation (FAO, 2014).

Graziano Neto (2013) states that, in order to promote rural poverty reduction, agricultural policies are needed that foment family farming to produce and sustainably develop. Sustainability generates employment and income combating poverty in rural area (BATISTA, 2014).

According to the definition adopted by the Brundtland Report (1987), sustainable development is understood as "Development that meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". For Schneider (2016), family farming has a strategic potential for sustainable rural development and for the maintenance of the population in rural areas.

The sustainability of this socio-productive model enables maintaining productivity, financial stability, food safety and the environmental quality of natural resources (ALVARENGA; FERNANDES; CAMPOS, 2011). Following, therefore, the accounting approach to sustainability defined by Momo, Araújo e Behr (2018), as well as the Johannesburg Declaration (2002), which establishes the three principles that guide the concept of sustainable development: economic development, social development and environmental protection.

## **3 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

As for nature, this research is classified as qualitative, which Godoy (1995) defines by the study of a certain phenomenon from the perspectives of the actors involved. As for the purpose, it is characterized as an exploratory research, whose main objective is the development and clarification of ideas regarding little explored themes (GIL, 2008). With regard to technical procedures, was adopted the research Participant, due to the researcher's involvement with the researched group, which allows the understanding and explanation of the events from the observations their natural contexts (GIVEN, 2008; MARIETTO, 2011)

This research involved the performance of five associations of family agriculture in the Amazon region, in the municipalities of Abaetetuba, Ananindeua, Barcarena, Belém e Santa Izabel. To facilitate the actions developed during the surveys of the associations were cataloged obeying the cryptography according to Table 1.

Table 1 – Categories of Participating Associations

<b>Name of Association</b>	<b>Location / City</b>	<b>Nº of Families</b>	<b>Initials</b>
Associação dos Feirantes da Feira do Agricultor Familiar de Abaetetuba	Abaetetuba - PA	70	AAF-1
Associação Parque dos Aracúãs do Cafezal	Barcarena - PA	70	AAF-2
Associação dos Produtores Orgânicos do Estado do Pará	Belém - PA	60	AAF-3
Associação Comunidade Bom Jesus	Santa Izabel - PA	80	AAF-4
Comunidade Abacatal	Ananindeua - PA	57	AAF-5
Total		337 Familys	

Source: Elaborated by the Authors

The total of 337 families were reached with the research which made data collection in two stages, being the first of January until February of 2018 and contemplated the search to identify the demands of the associations. The second phase, which took place from July to August 2018, was carried out in order to identify the impact of the research with the associations. In both steps for obtaining the data was used an instrument with semi-structured questions, which enables both objective responses as the use of additional questions to clarify answers less evidente; furthermore, it was considered the observations of researchers, considering the active role they have in the research (GIL, 2008).

The data were analyzed using the technique of content analysis (BARDIN, 1977). Therefore, the pre-analysis was carried out with writing and reading of the interviews. From the exploration of the material (performed in the pre-analysis), the following categories were selected: Accounting indicators; Demands of communities; Social Entrepreneurship; Associativism and Cooperativism; Family farming. In the second stage of data collection, the established categories were Difficulties; Contributions; Advances; and Challenges. Data were cut so as to differentiate and collect responses which was relevant to study. The accuracy of the method provided a diagnosis of the perception of the local reality (Amazon) of family farming, making it possible to identify the main demands of the communities.

## 4 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In order to convey the relevance and the accounting knowledge, as well as the management knowledge, in order to promote indicators that will serve as a basis for decision-making for family farmers in the Amazon region, was developed at the Faculty of Accouting Sciences of Federal University of Pará (*Faculdade de Ciências Contábeis da Universidade Federal do Pará – FACICON/UFPA*), with the support of the Pro-Rector of Extension (*Pró-Reitoria de Extensão – PROEX/UFPA*). In total, more than three hundred families were directly attended to the activities carried out by the program, providing a social impact relevant to the sustainable development of the region.

As for the participant research performed, with the content collected and transcribed it was possible to identify macro variables of the data, demands of associations, actions taken, and which associations were contemplated with the activities that met the demands, as can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 – Demands x Socio-productive Actions

Macro Category	Demands	Actions	Associations
Family Farming	Guidance on the access, requirements and stages of public notices, instructing them to participate in the PNAE and PAA; Educate members on the importance of environmental responsibility.	Course of Public Calls; Lecture on Environmental Accounting.	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4.
Accounting Indicators	Understand the design of management indicators of a rural property, control spending, know the opportunity cost in relation to equity and form the selling price.	Course on Financial Management and Personal Financial Planning; Course of Sale Price.	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4.
Associations and Cooperatives	Understand the role of association and associate in building actions to improve the community.	Lecture on Associativism and Cooperativism.	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
Social Entrepreneurship	Develop business planning of the association; Motivate community leaders so they can be more present in the association.	Business Models Workshop; Active participation in articulating with members and promoting the spirit of commitment in the association.	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4.

Source: Elaborated by the Authors

By analyzing Table 2 it is possible to identify in the first column the Macro, which brings the compact disposition of the subjects that had more prominence in the analyzed contents of the interviews category, technical visits and documents. Intentional division into categories enabled researchers to instigate farmers to identify and pinpoint the key demands needed for each Macro Category. Intentional division into categories enabled researchers to instigate farmers to identify the key demands needed for each Macro category.

The Demands (Table 2) are what farmers asked for as the most emergent. At this stage of the research, farmers were asked to point out what would most provide a socio-productive impact on associations and foster entrepreneurship, considering that courses, lectures and booklets would be formulated for each community demand.

The Actions (Table 2) reflect the activities carried out with family farmers. In this stage it should be highlighted the participation from the students of the Faculty of Accounting Sciences of the Federal University of Pará (Faculdade de Ciências Contábeis da Universidade Federal do Pará – FAC-ICON/UFGPA) that when analyzing the demands, comparing them with the contents of the disciplines already studied during the graduation, proposed the content of the booklets, lectures and courses, which, after being revised, were made available to the communities. As it is possible to identify all the associations present in the program participated in at least one of the activities developed.

After the development of productive activities in the socio associations, the survey collected data in order to identify with farmers which were the difficulties encountered during the process, the major contributions, the identified advances and the biggest challenges that these associations will have in the next years. Therefore Table 3 presents the reports identified in these categories by association.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Socio-productive Actions

<b>Evaluations</b>	<b>Reports</b>	<b>Association</b>
Difficulties	The geographical distance between its members;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Lack of interest of the members with the association;	AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4.
	The individualist thinking of constituents;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3.
	The insertion of young people in agriculture, due to the macro concentration in industries present in the cities;	AAF-1.
	"Outdated" persistence of individual farmers' thinking;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Dealing with the collective;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Financial obstacle;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Lack of government support.	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-4; AAF-5.
Contributions	With the help of the University the cooperative has become a "mirror" for other associations;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3.
	Help and improvement of marketed products;	AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	The expansion of knowledge of the family farmers association, through the participation of courses and workshops;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Knowledge led for the university through the students and teachers of the institution;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Organization of the association;	AAF-1; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Improvement of practices already carried out in the community.	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-4; AAF-5.
Advances	Knowledge acquired by the confraternity and the progress of the members;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4.
	Greater integration of the female audience in the activities of the association;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Product diversification;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-5.
	Knowledge acquired through the payment of members to the activity;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Awareness of the association's contribution to students and students to the association.	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4.
Challenges	Lack of know-how regarding production, and financial management;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	The lack of majority knowledge of the population in relation to organic products;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	Collective articulation;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	The lack of cooperative thinking to divide tasks among members.	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	• The organization of the association;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.
	• Cover more regions for the flow of production;	AAF-1; AAF-2; AAF-3; AAF-4; AAF-5.

Source: Elaborated by the Authors

The categories, named in Table 3 as evaluations, were in an induced way proposed by the researchers to identify with those of 337 families of farmers surveyed. This questionnaire, that was applied after workshops, courses and booklets, aimed to identify the main challenges, advances, contributions and difficulties that the proposed socio-productive actions have caused in associations.

## 5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This research aimed to analyze the scenario of family farming associations in the Amazon region to identify the demands of these associations, in order to propose solutions such as courses, lectures and accounting and management workshops in view of the development of socio-productive actions and local entrepreneurial attitudes.

With the identification of the demands needed to promote social entrepreneurship in the communities surveyed, it was possible to propose activities that will contribute to social and economic development of the community. The courses, lectures and workshops offered opportunities for debates on:

Business strategies through public calls, contributing to the identification of a new opportunity for commercialization the course of public calls guided the family producers on access, requirements and stages of public notices, instructing them to participate in programs of institutional market of food: National School Feeding Program (*Programa Nacional de Alimentação Escolar – PNAE*) and Food Acquisition Program (*Programa de Aquisição de Alimentos – PAA*), which allowed new perspectives and opportunities for the commercialization of its products.

Environmental Accounting, addressed the importance of transparency of production processes, maintaining the essence of extractivism, without harming the environment. The solution developed in a lecture format had the objective of raising awareness about the environmental impacts caused by agricultural activity, with a focus on sustainable development through the balanced use of natural resources, responsible for environmental events that impact on the management of the rural establishment.

Financial Management and Personal Financial Planning, guiding the planned and responsible use of money, enabled farmers to understand the importance, the role and how to use the tools of planning and control of financial resources, which help both the analysis of production performance and decision making, with the objective of optimizing the use of resources, and in the management of their personal finances.

Already the solution of Formation of Price of Sale, addressed in the form of course, relevant factors that determine the price of products, such as production costs, demand and competition, allowing producers to establish the value of their goods in order to secure their profit, but fair to other farmers as well as to consumers.

Associativism and Cooperativism in family farming, was another solution conveyed through a lecture that dealt with the opportunities and challenges in third sector organizations, as well as the organizational and legal differences between associations and cooperatives, highlighting the relevance of these entities for the development of the communities that are inserted.

Business Models, emphasized the importance of social entrepreneurship for society and for associations; this workshop solution allowed the creation of a business model - visual, flexible, collaborative and systemic tool - for family farming associations, based on the principles and characteristics of a social business with a view to the sustainable development of the association and local society.

Therefore, when analyzing the scenario of family agriculture in the associations researched, it was possible to identify characteristics that corroborate with the researches of Quintão (2004), which point the fight against poverty and social exclusion, employment and socio-professional insertion and local and sustainable development as the main potential and characteristics of social businesses, such as associations and cooperatives. Family farming, therefore, operates within the scope of these three issues, with emphasis on the overriding role of poverty, job creation and sustainable rural development.

The research also demonstrated the difficulties, contributions, advances and challenges in proposing socio-productive actions aimed at developing sustainable entrepreneurship in the Amazon. The main challenge is the particularity of the difficulty of the farmers with the logistics of meeting with the other associates, making it difficult to meet more frequently.

Already appointed as a primary attitude in third sector enterprises in researches of Lang e Fink (2018) the collective articulation among the associates as a way to overcome the difficulties of management positions of the association is still considered a challenge among the respondents. Often considered a logistical excuse, the meeting among members remains a challenge to promote union among members.

Financial obstacles were identified as difficulties by the associations interviewed, corroborating with the research of Frühauf (2014), which points to the problem of the distinction between personal expenses, production expenses and family expenses.

Identified government support is interpreted by many family members as a financial grant that should be passed on as government incentive. Different from the public policies identified in the surveys of Fischer (2002), Oliveira (2004) and Silva (2012), the associations researched were emphatic regarding the desired assistance. For associations, a monthly amount should be made available by the government to encourage permanence in Family Farming, as well as to ensure the social well-being of communities.

The lack of knowledge and access to information pointed out in the surveys of Lourenzani and Souza Filho (2009) and Silva (2017) were identified in the sample surveyed regarding the difficulty of finding productive techniques, access to new markets and also professional control of family economies.

This research presents limitations on the time of data collection, which despite having observed the rigor of the method in data collection, therefore greater analyzes could be done if the impact of the actions carried out during the insertion of the researchers in the community was evaluated. As a proposal for future research, it is recommended to apply in other communities, as well as, to evaluate, through performance measurement metrics, the results of the activities performed in order to discover the impact of socio-productive actions.

## REFERENCES

ALVARENGA, Anna Crystina; FERNANDES, Luiz Arnaldo; CAMPOS, Paula Camila de Oliveira. Avaliação de sistemas agroflorestais com base em indicadores de sustentabilidade de determinação rápida e fácil. In: CONGRESSO BRASILEIRO DE AGROECOLOGIA, 7., 2011, Fortaleza. **Anais...** Fortaleza: ABA-Agroecologia, 2011. Disponível em: <<http://revistas.aba-agroecologia.org.br/index.php/cad/article/view/10635/7233>>. Acesso em: 10 mai. 2018.

BARDIN, Laurence. **Análise de conteúdo**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1977.

BATISTA, H. R. **Ensaio sobre a redução da pobreza rural: contexto histórico, definição e estimativas**. 2014. 115 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ciências Econômicas) – Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Uberlândia, 2014.

BIKSE, V.; RIVZA, B.; RIEMERE, I. The Social Entrepreneur as a Promoter of Social Advancement. **Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences**, v. 185, p. 469–478, 2015. Elsevier. Disponível em: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815021989>>. Acesso em: 13 jun. 2018.

- BRANDÃO, Carlos. Rodrigues. **Parentes e Parceiros** In: ARANTES, Antônio Augusto. et al. **Colcha de retalhos: estudo sobre a família no Brasil**. São Paulo: UNICAMPI, 1993.
- CAMPELLI, M. G. L.; FILHO, N. C.; BARBEJAT, M. E. R. P.; MORITZ, G. de O. Empreendedorismo no Brasil: situação e tendências. **Revista de Ciências da Administração**, v. 13, n. 29, p. 112-132, 2011.
- CHAYANOV, Alexandre V. **La organización de la unidade econômica campesina**. Buenos Ayres: Visión, 1974.
- CHISWELL, H. M. From Generation to Generation: Changing Dimensions of Intergenerational Farm Transfer. **Sociologia Ruralis**, v. 58, n. 2, p. 104-125, jan. 2018.
- DE PAULA, M., KAMIMURA, Q., SILVA, J.. Mercados institucionais na agricultura familiar: dificuldades e desafios. **Revista de Política Agrícola**, v. 23, n. 1, p. 33-43 abr. 2014.
- DEPONTI, Cidonea Machado. As “agruras” da gestão da propriedade rural pela agricultura familiar. **Redes**, Santa Cruz do Sul, p. 9-24, set. 2014.
- DI DOMENICO, M., HAUGH, H.; TRACEY, P. Social Bricolage: theorizing social value creation in social enterprises. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, v. 34, p. 681-703, 2010.
- DOLABELA, F. **O segredo de Luísa: uma idéia, uma paixão e um plano de negócios: como nasce o empreendedor e se cria uma empresa**. Rio de Janeiro: Sextante, 2008.
- DWIVEDI, A.; WEERAWARDENA, J. Conceptualizing and operationalizing the social entrepreneurship construct. **Journal of Business Research**, v. 86, p. 32-40, 2018.
- FERRAZ, C. O.; PINTO, W. F. Tecnologia da Informação para a Agropecuária: Utilização de Ferramentas da Tecnologia da Informação no Apoio a Tomada de Decisões em Pequenas Propriedades. **RECoDAF – Revista Eletrônica Competências Digitais para Agricultura Familiar**, Tupã, v. 3, n. 1, p. 38-49, 2017.
- FISCHER, R. M. **O Desafio da Colaboração**. São Paulo: Gente, 2002.
- FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS. **Enhancing the Potential of Family Farming for Poverty Reduction and Food Security through Gender-Sensitive Rural Advisory Services**. Rome, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. **The State of Food and Agriculture 2014: Innovation in family farming**. Rome, 2014.
- FRÜHAUF, A. R. **Gestão financeira e produtiva do empreendimento rural: uma análise da propriedade Frühauf**. 2014. Monografia (Graduação em Administração - LFE Administração de Empresas) – Universidade do Vale do Taquari, Lajeado, 2014.
- GIL, A. C. **Métodos e Técnicas de Pesquisa Social**. 6. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2008.
- GIVEN, L. M. **The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods**. v.1, ed. 2. California, SAGE Publications, 2008.
- GODÓI-DE-SOUSA, E.; GANDOLFI, P. E.; GANDOLFI, M. R. C. Empreendedorismo Social no Brasil. Um Fenômeno de Inovação e Desenvolvimento Local. **Revista Dimensão Empresarial**, v. 9, n. 2, p. 22-34, 2011.

GODOY, A. S. Pesquisa Qualitativa: Tipos Fundamentais. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**. São Paulo, v. 35, n. 3, 1995.

GOMES, M. J. M. Muito além da subsistência: a agricultura familiar e sua produção nas mesas e na economia do país. **Tecnologia & Inovação Agropecuária**, São Paulo, v. 1, n.2, p. 4-6, dez. 2008.

GRAZIANO NETO, Francisco. Recolocando a questão agrária. In: STÉDILE, João Pedro (org.). **A questão agrária no Brasil: o debate na década de 1990**. 2. Ed. São Paulo: Editora Expressão Popular, 2013.

GUANZIROLI, Carlos Enrique; DI SABBATO, Alberto. Existe na agricultura brasileira um setor que corresponde ao “family farming” americano?. **Rev. Econ. Sociol. Rural**, Brasília, v. 52, supl. 1, p. 85-104, 2014.

HURTIENNE, Thomas Peter. Agricultura familiar e desenvolvimento rural sustentável na Amazônia. **Novos Cadernos NAEA**, Belém, v. 8, n. 1, p. 19-71, jun. 2005.

INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA. **Censo Agropecuário 2006 - Agricultura Familiar: Primeiros Resultados**. Rio de Janeiro, 2009.

JIAO, Hao. A conceptual model for social entrepreneurship directed toward social impact on society. **Social Enterprise Journal**, v. 7, n. 2, p. 130-149, 2011.

JUNQUEIRA, I. B. **A análise do processo de organização do grupo “Direto da Roça”: estudo de caso em uma organização socioprodutiva no município de Itajubá-MG**. 2015. 110 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Desenvolvimento, Tecnologias e Sociedade) – Universidade Federal de Itajubá, Itajubá, 2015.

LANG, R.; FINK, M. Rural social entrepreneurship: The role of social capital within and across institutional levels. **Journal of Rural Studies**, 2018.

LIMA, F. A. X.; VARGAS, L. P. Alternativas socioeconômicas para os agricultores familiares: o papel de uma associação agroecológica. **Rev. Ceres**, Viçosa, v. 62, n. 2, p. 159-166, Abr. 2015.

LOURENZANI, W. L.; PINTO, L. B.; CARVALHO, E. C. A.; CARMO, S. M. A qualificação em gestão da agricultura familiar: a experiência da Alta Paulista. **Revista Ciência em Extensão**, v. 4, n. 1, p. 62-76, 2008.

LOURENZANI, W. L.; SOUZA FILHO, H. M. Gestão integrada para a agricultura familiar. In: SOUZA FILHO, H. M.; BATALHA, M. O. **Gestão integrada da agricultura familiar**. São Carlos: EdUFSCar, 2009.

MACKE, J.; SARATE, J. A. R.; DOMENEGHINI, J.; SILVA, K. A. DA. Where do we go from now? Research framework for social entrepreneurship. **Journal of Cleaner Production**, v. 183, p. 677–685, 2018.

MARIETTO, M. L. **Estratégia como Prática: Um estudo das práticas da ação estratégica nas MPES situadas em clusters comerciais competitivos**. 2011. Dissertação (Mestrado Profissional em Administração) – Centro Universitário Campo Limpo Paulista, Campo Limpo Paulista, 2011.

MELO NETO, Francisco Paulo de; FROES, César. **Empreendedorismo social: a transição para a sociedade sustentável**. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark, 2002.

MOMO, F. S.; ARAUJO, M. V.; BEHR, A. Contabilidade e Sustentabilidade nos ENANPADS: 2010-2016. **ReA UFSM**, v. 11, Edição Especial, p. 505-517, 2018.

NEVES, Edson Oliveira; GUEDES, Cezar Augusto Miranda; DOS SANTOS, Kléber Carvalho. Empreendedorismo social e sustentabilidade: um estudo de caso sobre o projeto “mulheres em ação jogando limpo com a natureza” do IFNMG. **Revista da FAE**, v. 13, n. 2, p. 1-14, 2010.

OLIVEIRA, E. M. Empreendedorismo social no Brasil atual configuração, perspectivas e desafios: notas introdutórias. **Revista da FAE**, v. 7, n. 2, p. 9-18, 2004.

QUINTÃO, C. desenvolvimento local da comunidade as quais estão inseridas. In: SEMINÁRIO TRABALHO SOCIAL E MERCADO DE EMPREGO, 2004, Porto. **Anais eletrônicos...** Porto: U.PORTO, FLUP, 2004. Disponível em: < <https://repositorio-aberto.up.pt/handle/10216/54371>>. Acesso em: 24 mai. 2018.

ROCHA JUNIOR, C. J. G.; CABRAL, R. M. O Processo de Transição de Empreendimentos Rurais Tradicionais para as Agroindústrias Associativas no Estado de Pernambuco: Desafios para Construir Competências Empreendedoras. **Gestão & Regionalidade**, v. 32, n. 94, p. 68-83, 2016.

ROTHAERMEL, F. T.; AGUNG, S. D.; JIANG, L. University entrepreneurship: A taxonomy of the literature. **Industrial and Corporate Change**, v. 16, n. 4, p. 691–791, 2007.

SARAIVA, E. B.; SILVA, A. P. F.; SOUZA, A. A.; CERQUEIRA, G. F.; CHAGAS, C. M. S.; TORAL, N. Panorama da compra de alimentos da agricultura familiar para o Programa Nacional de Alimentação Escolar. **Revista Ciência & Saúde Coletiva**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 18, n. 4, p. 927-935, abr. 2013.

SCHNEIDER, S. A presença e as potencialidades da Agricultura Familiar na América Latina e no Caribe. **Redes**, Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 21, n. 3, p. 11-33, out. 2016.

SILVA, C. M. V.; SCHULTZ, G. Acesso a mercados e gestão de cooperativas da agricultura familiar no Brasil. **Revista Espacios**, v. 38, n. 44, p. 23-38, 2017.

SILVA, Maria Ozanira da Silva e. Pobreza, desigualdade e políticas públicas: caracterizando e problematizando a realidade brasileira. **Revista Katálysis**, Florianópolis, v. 13, n. 2, p. 155-163, mar. 2011.

SILVA, S. A. D. A Importância da Gestão nas Pequenas Propriedades Rurais. **Revista Acadêmica Conecta FASF**, v. 1, n. 2, p. 272-285, 2017.

SILVA, Sandro Pereira. **Políticas públicas, agricultura familiar e desenvolvimento territorial: uma análise dos impactos socioeconômicos do PRONAF no território médio Jequitinhonha – MG**. Brasília: IPEA Textos para discussão 1693, 2012.

SIMIONI, F. J.; BINOTTO, E.; BATTISTON, J. Informação e Gestão na Agricultura Familiar da Região Oeste de Santa Catarina. **Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional**, v. 11, n. 3, p. 152-177, dez. 2015.

UNITED NATIONS. **Our Common Future**. 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. **The Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development**. 2002