

FAMILY AGRICULTURE AND SOCIAL REPRODUCTION: SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERIZATION OF A GROUP OF RURAL FAMILY AGROINDUSTRIES IN THE WEST OF PARANÁ

Fabíola Graciele Besen¹
Clério Plein²
Juarez Bortolanza³
Valdir Serafim Junior⁴

Abstract:

The article aims to present the characteristics of the production and commercialization processes in a group of rural properties that partially / totally transform the raw material (agroindustrialization) in the municipalities of Western Paraná. The studied sample comprises a group of 35 rural family agribusinesses located in the West region of Paraná, whose information was extracted from the questionnaires and reports of the Analysis of the family agribusinesses of BP3 carried out by BIOLABORE (Cooperative of Technical Assistance of Paraná) by the Cultivando Água Boa da Itaipu Binacional, from 2015 to 2018. The research is classified as descriptive in terms of typology, with a quantitative approach and documentary analysis. The characterization deals with the family agroindustrialization process, from the constitution of the agribusiness, labor, potentialities, problems currently faced, legislation, production and origin of raw material, costs and prices, types of products sold, and other relevant data for analysis. The results indicate that in the cases studied, the family agroindustry is an important strategy for social reproduction and rural development for this group of family farmers to diversify activities and add value to agricultural enterprises.

Key words: Family agribusiness; Local development; West of Paraná.

AGRICULTURA FAMILIAR E REPRODUÇÃO SOCIAL: CARACTERIZAÇÃO SOCIOECONÔMICA DE UM GRUPO DE AGROINDÚSTRIAS FAMILIARES RURAIS DO OESTE DO PARANÁ

Resumo:

O artigo tem a finalidade de apresentar as características dos processos de produção e de comercialização em um grupo de propriedades rurais que transformam parcialmente/totalmente a matéria-prima (agroindustrialização) nos municípios do Oeste do

¹ Bacharel em Ciências Contábeis. Mestre em Extensão Inovadora e Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável. Doutora em Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável pela Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste). Professora do Curso de Ciências Contábeis da Unioeste – Campus de Foz do Iguaçu. E-mail: fabiolagracielebesen@gmail.com.

² Doutor em Desenvolvimento Rural - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul – UFRGS. Professor Adjunto Curso de Serviço Social - Unioeste – Campus de Francisco Beltrão. E-mail: clerioplein@gmail.com.

³ Pós – doutor em Gestão Universitária (UFSC – SC), Doutor em Engenharia da produção (UFSC – SC). Mestre em Engenharia da produção (UFSC – SC). Professor Adjunto do curso de Administração – UNIOESTE – MCR. E-mail: juarezbortolanza@gmail.com.

⁴ Bacharel em Ciências Contábeis. Mestre em Extensão Inovadora e Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável. Doutor em Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável pela Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste). Professor do Curso de Ciências Contábeis da Unioeste – Campus de Foz do Iguaçu. E-mail: jr_valdir@hotmail.com.

Paraná. A amostra estudada compreende um grupo de 35 agroindústrias familiares rurais situadas na região Oeste do Paraná, cujas informações foram extraídas dos questionários e relatórios da Análise das agroindústrias familiares da BP3 efetuada pela BIOLABORE (Cooperativa de Assistência Técnica do Paraná) pelo Projeto Cultivando Água Boa da Itaipu Binacional, no período de 2015 a 2018. A pesquisa se classifica como descritiva quanto a tipologia, com abordagem quantitativa e análise documental. A caracterização trata do processo de agroindustrialização familiar, desde a constituição da agroindústria, mão de obra, potencialidades, problemas enfrentados na atualidade, legislação, produção e origem de matéria-prima, custos e preços, tipos de produtos comercializados e outros dados relevantes para análise. Os resultados indicam que nos casos estudados, a agroindústria familiar é uma importante estratégia de reprodução social e de desenvolvimento rural para esse grupo de agricultores familiares para diversificar as atividades e agregar valor aos empreendimentos agropecuários.

Palavras-Chave: Agroindústria familiar; Desenvolvimento local; Oeste do Paraná.

1 - Introduction

The economic development model and technological package, implemented from the 1960s, called the Green Revolution, brought a new organization of the rural environment based on a homogenizing policy. This process increased agricultural productivity, but reduced farmers' ability to organize and manage their production (Karnoop et al, 2016; Spanevello et al, 2019).

Family farming survives in a scenario of marketization and modernization of Brazilian agriculture. According to Plein (2010, p. 98), family production models have shown resistance even 'in the agrarian structure in the countries where the capitalist mode of production developed most, especially in the post-war period (1945-1973)' by food production.

Studies related to rural family farming and its reproduction strategies state that the full operation of the productive unit may not be the family unit's major objective (Neves, 1995). It should also be considered that there is an organization between principles of production and work organization and family projects resulting from the dynamics of the family organization (Deponti, 2007).

Among the family projects resulting from the dynamics of a family organization are the family agroindustries. The rural family agroindustry "is an agro-productive enterprise that adds value to the primary products produced by the family product and over time has become an alternative to supplement the income of small rural producers" (Anes, Deponti & Arend, 2018).

According to Mior (2005), the Rural Family Agroindustry is derived from family farming, where part of the vegetable and animal production is transformed into processed products adding greater marketing value. The logic of the family agroindustry is different from conventional agroindustry, it must belong to the family, an association, or a network of family associations/cooperatives; it must produce its own raw materials or buy them in small quantities from neighboring farmers; its labor force must be predominantly family-based, and it should have kinship and blood ties over generations.

The rural family agroindustry allowed the valorization of organic products, with the denomination of origin, and family farming, which became associated with tradition, nature, artisanal, and local - a set of important values for the consumer market (Wilkinson, 2003).

From these considerations, this paper aims to present the characteristics of the production and commercialization processes in a group of rural properties that partially/fully transform the raw material (agroindustrialization) in the municipalities of western Paraná. Based on the general objective, the specific objectives were defined:

- a) Characterize the properties where the rural family agribusinesses of the sample are located;
- b) Identify the production process of the rural family agribusinesses;
- c) To present the commercialization process of the rural family agribusinesses.

The information was extracted from the reports of the BP3 family agribusiness analysis carried out by BIOLABORE (Cooperative of Technical Assistance of Paraná) by the Cultivating Good Water Project of Itaipu Binacional, in the period from 2015 to 2018.

Several researches have already been conducted on the subject, in order to identify how agribusinesses contribute to the reproduction of family farming and to rural development. Works such as those by Amorim and Stadutto (2008), Matei & Silva (2015), and Spanevello et al (2019), which studied the importance of agroindustrialization processes in rural farms. Thus, the study is justified by the importance of agroindustrialization as an important strategy of social reproduction and rural development for this group of family farmers, contributing to the permanence of these families in the countryside, by diversifying productive activities on rural properties, and by generating extra income.

This paper is structured, initially, by this introduction, followed by a review of the theory on family agribusiness. Subsequently, the method and the discussion of the results found are described. And, finally, the concluding remarks are followed by the researched references.

2 – Theoretical Referential

This topic addresses the rural environment panorama from a theoretical review of family farming and rural family agribusiness.

2.1 - Socioeconomic reproduction of family farming

Rural Development is linked, according to Ramos (2001), to the improvement in the quality of life of rural populations and the use of land through sustainable techniques or exercising agricultural activities, always focused on environmental preservation.

According to Veiga et al. (2001), the presence of family farming in the Brazilian rural environment is essential, because a rural region will have a more active future if the ability to diversify the local economy is driven by the characteristics of its agriculture.

The FAO estimates that "family farming is by far the most prevalent form of agriculture in the world. Estimates suggest that it occupies about 70-80% of agricultural land and produces more than 80% of the world's food in value terms" (2014a, p. 11).

Family farming presents itself as an alternative for people to stay in the countryside, linked to assumptions of economic growth, but with respect for nature, through sustainable exploitation procedures. However, there are several types of family farmers, who proceed

with different production logics, use different technologies and production practices, as well as their own relationship with the market (Abramovay, 2007).

In the 2017 Agricultural Census, 3,897,408 establishments met the Law's criteria and were classified as family farming, which represents 77% of agricultural establishments. They occupy an area of 81 million hectares, or 23% of the total area of Brazilian agricultural establishments. Family farming was responsible for 23% of the total value of the establishments' production. It maintains 77% of all people engaged in agriculture and cattle raising in the country, around 10.1 million people. (IBGE, Agro Census 2017).

A study developed by the United Nations Development Programme (2011) suggests that "family farming could be decisive in generating environmental resilience and strengthening rural livelihoods such that they are more sustainable and able to cope with the environmental transformations generated by climate change" (Schneider, 2016, p. 13).

Wilkinson (1999, 2000) has defended in his studies that family farming should actively participate in agroindustrialization, an alternative that can be a way to strengthen its capacity for social reproduction. He also states that there is a need for public policies for agroindustrialization, which range from the informal market to niche markets, organic products, and differentiated quality (Mior, 2003).

2.2 Rural Family Agribusiness

One of the ways resulting from the dynamics of the family organization is agribusiness. The family agribusiness "is an agro-productive enterprise that adds value to the primary products produced by the family and over time has become an alternative to supplement the income of small rural producers" (Anes, Deponti & Arend, 2018, p. 110).

Two factors led to the emergence of the family agribusiness: the first factor is economic because when the producer cannot commercialize all his/her production *in natura*, he/she seeks to add value to the products by transforming them. The second factor is social since it is associated with the producer's desire to remain in the countryside, seeking the involvement of all family members in production. (Ruiz et al., 2010).

The emergence of rural agribusinesses can be characterized as a reconfiguration of the colonial product produced by family farming. This colonial product started to be processed by agribusinesses and became a higher value product with the possibility of generating higher income for families (Mior, 2005).

Other census data reveal that family farming agribusinesses account for the largest share of the value added to the production associated with food processing. This social segment is responsible for 78.40% of the added value, while non-family agriculture agribusinesses cover a percentage of 21.60%. This ratifies the more expressive weight of family farms in this type of agri-food production strategy, as already mentioned by other studies (Mior, 2005; Wilkinson, 2008; Gazolla; Pelegrini, 2011 apud Gazolla et al, 2012). (Translated by the authors)

Prezotto (2002) states that 'family agribusiness' rescues the social knowledge of the family production units regarding food processing that, throughout time, has always existed on rural properties and has been forgotten during the process of modernization of agriculture.

Other aspects of the family agroindustry consist of location in the rural environment, machinery, and equipment used on a smaller scale, own raw material (animal or vegetable origin) or coming from neighbors, artisanal production, and work performed by the family

members themselves, with sporadic external labor. The producers also get together through associative ventures (Mior, 2005).

The addition of value in rural agroindustry is also directly associated with the use of productive inputs, which demonstrates the potential of the activity in reducing dependence on external resources and agents. The use of own raw material, in family farming establishments, is "equal or superior to 75%, reaching proportions equivalent to 91% for the production of *rapadura* (brown sugar candy), 90% for cassava flour, 89% for cheese, and 88% for *tapioca* (cassava starch food). And even when raw material is purchased, this usually occurs in proximity circuits that nurture community relations" (Bastian et al., 2014, p. 65).

According to Bonamigo and Schneider (2007), it is possible to highlight some common characteristics in most of the agro-industrial units: the agroindustries use little physical space for the manufacturing of the products; the production of the agroindustries is focused, above all, on local markets; family members, in most cases, are involved in the production, showing that the labor force is usually family-owned; the production factors are based on farming practices; the knowledge of product transformation was acquired through experiences and practices left by the ancestors, transmitted and improved with each new generation.

Agribusiness is one of the main generators of direct and indirect jobs per unit of invested capital. Data from the Economic Department of the BNDS and the IBGE clearly show this characteristic in the Brazilian case, where, for every million dollars invested, the agricultural and agro-industrial enterprises generate 118 to 182 jobs, about 80% more than investments in a traditionally labor-intensive segment such as the commercial sector" (Trentin, 2001, p. 13). (Translated by the authors)

In Brazil, according to the Agro Census 2017 (IBGE 2017), there are 215,226 agricultural establishments of the patronal agriculture with agroindustries and in family agriculture, this figure reaches 1,311,830 establishments with rural agroindustry. The value of production is R\$ 8,475,295.00 for patronal agriculture and R\$ 6,351,512.00 in family agriculture. According to Fernandes Filho & Campos (2003, p. 871), "the region that shows a greater diversity of rural agroindustry products is the South region."

In the State of Paraná, according to the 2017 Agro Census (IBGE, 2017), the number of non-family agroindustries that exist in agricultural establishments corresponds to 8,413 units, and in family farming, this number rises to 34,502 rural family agroindustries. The value of production in non-family agroindustries is R\$ 394,049.00 and in family agroindustries is R\$ 322,056.00.

From the mid-1990s on, Brazil began to consider the rural family agroindustry as an efficient strategy for rural development, and so a significant growth was observed in the supply of agro-industrial products, coming from street markets, cooperatives, and producer associations linked to family farmers, and direct sales to consumers (Maluf, 2009, Carvalheiro, 2010).

The family agroindustry, when valued in rural areas, becomes a strategy for social reproduction since it brings opportunities to add value to the production of rural families, generating income and jobs for those producers who opt for activities of transformation of the raw materials they already produce (Pelegrini; Gazzola, 2008), and this study seeks to present

these characteristics in this group of 35 rural family agroindustries located in the western region of Paraná.

2.3 Previous Studies

Amorim and Stadutto (2008), aimed at analyzing the organization of family rural agro-industry production as a rural development strategy. The agroindustrialization of food presents itself as an alternative for pluriactive families by increasing family income in the western region of Paraná. The complexity of rural issues has advanced the discussion from conventional rural development strategies, which have not reduced poverty in rural areas, to a territorial approach to rural development. In this work, the theoretical perspective of networks was used to analyze rural development. The results show that the horizontal networks in western Paraná are still incipient, but they have been joined by rural producers, who have shown good results in the development of their activities and potential growth.

Matei and Silva (2015) conducted a study that analyzes 10 empirical cases of family agroindustries in Serra Gaúcha as an innovative activity that encourages autonomy and contributes to the improvement of quality of life and to the maintenance of families in rural spaces in Brazil. It highlights how certain public programs and policies have resulted in a favorable institutional environment for family farming at the national and state levels. It presents how these farmers carry out innovative processes, optimizing the use of their available resources (land, family labor, knowledge). As result, it shows the interaction of these family farmers with the institutional environment, favoring and improving these practices, inserting them into a local alternative agri-food system.

Dotto, Plein, Hein, Zanco, and Fariña (2018) sought in their study to identify some concepts that guide family farming and agroindustry based on a small property. They concluded that small property serves as the basis for family farming, which needs qualifications to produce with sustainability. It must still have conditions so that the rural family agriculture and agroindustry can manage their activity, control costs and expenses, avoid waste and losses, and take advantage of opportunities and production alternatives in the various sectors of the economy. They concluded that the opportunities for agriculture and rural family agroindustry are being expanded since the demand for products of this nature is growing.

Spanevello et al (2019), sought to analyze - in a specific case - the importance of agroindustrialization processes in farms that partially/fully transform the raw material, seeking to answer: what is the importance of agroindustrialization processes in farms? How do Rural Family Agroindustries (RFAs) promote the socio-economic reproduction of the family unit? The empirical research context involved the municipalities of Santo Augusto and Campo Novo/RS in the period of December 2017. The method consisted of a case study with four RFAs defined as agroindustry A (molasses processor), agroindustry B (processed meat), agroindustry C (cassava), and agroindustry D (baked goods). The results showed that ARFs emerge as new rural development practices, to the extent that they guarantee the permanence of families in the countryside, especially young people, and women. It is used by farmers as a complementary income strategy, adding value to products and diversification through pluriactive activities, in the search for a better quality of life for the family. The RFAs also contribute directly to the local socio-economic development, preserving the culture and traditions, since their products are sold in the municipality, such as supermarkets, schools, and fairs, among others.

These studies have shown that agroindustry is a strategy to increase income, seeking the permanence of the family in the countryside and expanding the opportunities for rural family agriculture and agroindustry, due to the growth in demand for products of this nature.

3 – Method

At first, the research is classified as bibliographic, which according to Gil (2010), is prepared based on previously published materials (theses, dissertations, papers), and it was used for the survey of the conceptual basis and similar studies related to the theme.

Regarding the characteristics of the field of observation, it is necessary to use descriptive research, which in the conception of Gil (2010) seeks to describe the characteristics of a given population or phenomenon or the establishment of relationships among variables. Thus, it was possible to describe the characteristics of the phenomena that occur in the field of observation, which in this research are the agroindustries.

The approach consists of a quantitative approach of secondary socioeconomic data because there was tabulation of data from a questionnaire. The questionnaire was filled out by the owners of 128 agroindustries in western Paraná, and it was carried out by BIOLABORE (Cooperative of Technical Assistance of Paraná) by the Cultivating Good Water Project of Itaipu Binacional, in the period from 2015 to 2018.

The questionnaire made available by BIOLABORE is extensive and provides socioeconomic information about the property and the agroindustry, facilities, production, access to information, waste disposal, marketing space, difficulties, differentials of the marketed products, and income. The study characterizes the data from the properties, the process of family agroindustrialization, since the constitution of the agroindustry, labor, potentialities, problems faced nowadays, legislation, production and origin of raw material, costs and prices, types of commercialized products, and other relevant data.

The research is classified as documentary, which is very similar to the bibliographic, but the difference lies in the nature of the sources, because while the bibliographic research uses fundamentally the contributions of various authors on a given subject, the documentary research is based on materials that have not received any scientific treatment or that can be reworked according to the research objectives (Marconi & Lakatos, 2010).

The data used in the research are the information extracted from questionnaires and reports of the Socioeconomic Analysis of 128 family agroindustries of BP3 carried out by BIOLABORE (Cooperative of Technical Assistance of Paraná) by the Cultivating Good Water Project of Itaipu Binacional, in the period from 2015 to 2018. The sample in this study includes 35 family agroindustries. The sample is limited to this number of 35 agroindustries because they were the documents made available in the period by BIOLABORE to the authors of the study.

4 – Characterization of the Family Agroindustries

This chapter is a data survey with the objective of providing a characterization of the family agroindustries in some localities of western Paraná (Céu Azul, Entre Rios do Oeste,

Guaíra, Matelândia, Medianeira, Pato Bragado, São Pedro do Iguaçu, and Vera Cruz do Oeste). It is characterized as a descriptive study of the information extracted from questionnaires and reports of the Socioeconomic Analysis of BP3 family agroindustries carried out by BIOLABORE (Cooperative of Technical Assistance of Paraná) by the Cultivating Good Water Project of Itaipu Binacional, in the period from 2016 to 2018.

According to the National Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform (INCRA, 2008), family farming in western Paraná corresponds to 75% of agricultural establishments, an important factor that led to the choice of the region for the research.

4.1– Panel of the Western Region of Paraná

The territory of the Western Region of Paraná, located on the third plateau of Paraná, is limited to the south, by the Iguaçu River, in the southwestern region; to the north, by the Piquiri River, in the northwestern region; to the east by the Guarani River, with the Pitanga and Campo Mourão Region, and to the west, by the Paraná River, establishing the border with the Republics of Paraguay and Argentina. It covers an area of 2,290,859 ha, which corresponds to 11.5% of the state territory. It has 50 municipalities, among which Cascavel, Foz do Iguaçu and Toledo stand out, due to their population sizes and polarization levels (Ipardes, 2019).

The municipalities studied are part of the axis Foz do Iguaçu x Guaíra, Foz do Iguaçu x Cascavel. According to Table 1, which brings the characterization of the municipalities as to their colonization, it is identified the predominance of Germans and Italians, coming from the states of Rio Grande do Sul and Santa Catarina. The colonization predominantly by migrants from the states of Rio Grande do Sul and Santa Catarina. These migrants, in turn, were largely descendants of Germans, Italians, and Poles (Ipardes, 2019).

Table 1 – Identification of the municipalities in Western Paraná

Municipality	Area Km ²	Emancipation	Predominant colonization	Total population	Urban population	Urban %	Rural population	Rural %	HDI 2010
CÉU AZUL	1,180,163	1968 MATELÂNDIA	German, Italian (RS, SC)	11,709	8,387	71.63	2,645	28.37	0.732
ENTRE RIOS DO OESTE	120,327	1993 MAL CDO RONDON	German, Italian (RS, SC)	4,481	2,642	58.96	1,284	41.04	0.761
GUAÍRA	568,845	1952 FOZ DO IGUAÇU	Diverse Ethnicities	32,923	28,206	85.67	2,498	14.33	0.724
MATELÂNDIA	642,030	1961 (FOZ DO IGUAÇU)	German, Italian (RS, SC)	17,775	11,613	65.33	4,465	34.67	0.725
MEDIANEIRA	325,167	1961 FOZ DO IGUAÇU	German, Italian (RS, SC)	45,812	37,390	81.62	4,427	18.38	0.763
PATO BRAGADO	136,781	1993 MAL CDO RONDON	German, Italian (RS, SC)	5,535	2,993	54.07	1,829	45.93	0.747
SÃO PEDRO DO IGUAÇU	308,123	1993 TOLEDO	German, Italian (RS, SC), from Minas Gerais and Northeasterners	5,976	4,055	67.85	2,436	32.15	0.683
VERA CRUZ DO OESTE	326,398	1983 CÉU AZUL	Northern Paraná	8,590	6,863	79.90	2,110	20.10	0.699
TOTAL	3,607,834	–	–	132,801	102,149	76.91	21,694	23.09	–

Source: IPARDES, 2019, adapted by the authors.

Currently, the West region stands out on the international scene due to its location, presenting a differentiated socio-spatial relationship, both by the border economic flow, and

by the reconfiguration of the territory, caused by the construction of the Itaipu Power Plant, which changed the landscape, the regional economic and social relations, highlighting the receipt of royalties by the bordering municipalities, which represents a source of investment for actions aimed at socio-economic development (Casagrande & De Souza, 2013).

4.2 Characterization of the Family Agroindustries

In this topic, the family agroindustries in the research were characterized. The sample researched (35 family agroindustries) belongs to families that live in rural areas and develop agricultural and non-agricultural activities inside or outside the property, considered pluriactive. It is worth noting that the activities performed by the families suggest the need for the allocation of farming and agroindustrialization activities, so much that - in almost all the properties surveyed - family members can be seen performing both activities.

In table 02, below, are the data of the area and property domain of the owners of the family agroindustries. For the classification of family farming units, the concept of family farming was considered according to Law 11.326/2006, also known as the 'Family Farming Law,' created in 2006, which considers a family farmer:

the one who practices activities in the rural environment, simultaneously meeting the following requirements: I not owing, for any reason, an area larger than four (4) fiscal modules; II using predominantly his/her own family's labor in the economic activities of his/her establishment or enterprise; III having a family income predominantly originating from economic activities linked to his/her own establishment or enterprise; IV managing his/her establishment or enterprise with his/her family. (Translated by the authors)

Most of the properties (82% of the sample) are between 1 and 20 ha, classifying them as family farming. Only two properties exceed the limit considered as family farming.

Table 2 – Size and legal domain of the properties of 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Size of property area in Ha	Legal ownership of the property area		
	Own areas	Areas ceded from third parties	Total
Up to 1 ha	8	0	8
From 2 to 10 ha	9	1	10
From 11 to 20 ha	10	0	10
From 21 to 30 ha	2	0	2
From 31 to 40 ha	2	0	2
From 41 to 50 ha	1	0	1
Over 71 ha	2	0	2
TOTAL	34	1	35

Source: Research data.

This aspect was identified in the study by Amorin and Staduto (2007) also in western Paraná, where 72.5% of the properties with agroindustries analyzed have up to 20 hectares and 80% continued with the same amount of land after the industrialization of the production in the households.

The family agroindustries have the most varied agro-industrial activities and commercialize their products in several ways. Agroindustrialization is understood as the processing and/or transformation of products from agricultural, extractive, forestry, livestock, fishing, and aquaculture exploitation. The process can be simple, such as drying, grading, cleaning, and packaging, to more complex processes, such as oil extraction, fermentation, and caramelization. Handicrafts can also be included since most of the time they are made in rural areas. (Silva; Giles, 1998).

The number of family agroindustries per municipality is shown in Table 3. It can be observed that the municipality of Medianeira stands out for the total number of family agroindustries (15), demonstrating the entrepreneurial potential of these farmers.

Table 3 – Number of family agroindustries by municipality (2015-2018).

Municipalities	Number of Family Agroindustries	Percentage
CÉU AZUL	2	5.7
ENTRE RIOS DO OESTE	3	8.6
GUAÍRA	3	8.6
MATELÂNDIA	2	5.7
MEDIANEIRA	15	42.9
PATO BRAGADO	5	14.3
SÃO PEDRO DO IGUAÇU	3	8.6
VERA CRUZ DO OESTE	2	5.7
TOTAL	35	100.0

Source: Research data.

As for the size of the family agroindustries, it was identified that the biggest part (71%) is in the range of 1 to 99 m², 22.9% is in the range of 100 to 199 m², and 5.7 of the total is in the range of 200 to 299 m². They are small spaces, and from the total of 35, twenty-six are already made of masonry, a specific building for the segment (processing), according to the norms in effect. As most of the spaces are small, it is worth analyzing the financial conditions, the situational scenario of each family, and the potential to continue with the activities, among other factors.

Family or small rural agroindustries have distinct characteristics from a medium or large company in the agri-food sector, especially because it is an activity based on diversification, multifunctionality, and verticalization of production processes. Besides this, they seek cost reduction and competitiveness in the markets to guarantee the reproduction of their family structure. As a competitive advantage, they have property rights over the main inputs, that is, over the main resources needed for the production process (land, family labor, and knowledge). (Matei & Silva, 2015, p. 12) (Translated by the authors)

It was identified that 15 family agroindustries have only two members on the property and 9 have only 3 members, totaling a percentage of 68.6% of the sample. It can be inferred that the family is structured only in husband and wife, with 1 or 2 children at most, since

17.1% has 4 members on the property. These three ranges (2, 3, 4 members total 85.7% of the sample).

The agroindustry hires outsourced labor, but only 22.9% of the sample makes use of this labor since, out of the total time dedicated to agroindustrialization, 57.1% of the sample answered that they work full time on the activity and 40% partially. Two factors may contribute to the hiring of this labor force, few family members on the property, or periods of seasonality, in which the work in the production and industrialization process increases.

4.3 – Characterization of the production process of rural family agroindustries

By implanting an agroindustry, the farmer starts to act in two important stages of the productive chain: the primary and secondary sectors, because he/she produces and industrializes part of his/her production (Prezotto, 2002).

Table 4 shows the survey of the types of industrialized products in the family agroindustries, indicating the frequencies with which they were mentioned during the application of the questionnaire/characterization. A diversity of production was identified in these family agroindustries, where, in several cases, they operate in more than one segment, taking advantage of the raw material available on the property and local know-how that stems from knowledge inherited from past generations.

According to Marsden (1998), this artisanal model of production (acquired local culture and knowledge) despised by the process of agricultural modernization, is beginning to be seen as an identified market opportunity and an alternative source of income for farms, although, one of the difficulties, presented by Gazolla (2017), is to maintain the supply of some foods throughout the year, due to the seasonality of production.

Among the products contained in Table 3, baking stands out in 15 family agroindustries, pasta in second place in 7 family agroindustries, and the production of sugar cane brandy in 5 properties. By municipality, the production of sugar cane brandy and brown sugar stands out in the municipality of Medianeira, with four and three occurrences, respectively. In the family agroindustries, it is highlighted that the process is done manually, on a small scale and the offer is differentiated products from the conventional market.

Table 4 – Products versus municipality of the 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

		Municipality								Total
		CA	ERO	GUA	MAT	MED	PB	SPI	VCO	
Brown Sugar	Counting	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	8.6%	0%	0%	0%	8.6%
Sugar cane brandy	Counting	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5
	% Total	2.9%	0%	0%	0%	11.4%	0%	0%	0%	14.3%
Canned vegetables	Counting	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
	% Total	0%	0%	2.9%	2.9%	0%	2.9%	0%	0%	8.6%
Peanut derivatives	Counting	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
	% Total	0%	5.7%	0%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	0%	0%	14.3%
Corn derivatives	Counting	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%
Candies,	Counting	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

jams, and schmiers	% Total	0%	0%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%	0%	0%	0%	8.6%
Meat processed	Counting	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.7%	0%	0%	5.7%
Pasta	Counting	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	7
	% Total	0%	2.9%	0%	0%	5.7%	2.9%	5.7%	2.9%	20.0%
Honey	Counting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%	2.9%
Baked goods	Counting	1	3	1	1	3	2	2	2	15
	% Total	2.9%	8.6%	2.9%	2.9%	8.6%	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%	42.9%
Juices and pulps	Counting	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	4
	% Total	0%	0%	2.9%	0%	5.7%	2.9%	0%	0%	11.4%
Meat derivatives and processed	Counting	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.7%	0%	0%	5.7%
Chicken	Counting	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%	2.9%	0%	0%	5.7%
Cheese	Counting	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%	0%	0%	2.9%
Sugar cane juice	Counting	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%	0%	2.9%
Cassava	Counting	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%
TOTAL	Counting	2	3	3	2	15	5	3	2	35
	% Total	5.7%	8.6%	8.6%	5.7%	42.9%	14.3%	8.6%	5.7%	100.0%

Source: Research data.

Production deals with the quantity and what to produce, besides the available space and target audience. Thus, "to add value to the product, one should highlight aspects such as quality, standardization, selection, production process, as well as the incorporation of simple steps, pre-processing, conservation, cleaning or packaging" (Schinaider, Bezerra, Santos Júnior, Atiyel & Capistrano, 2018).

According to Wilkinson (1999), family agro-industry products are the result of traditional know-how, passed down through generations, or knowledge acquired through courses and/or a market opportunity. The quality of these products comes from know-how, knowledge acquired, and the climatic conditions existing in the territory of these agroindustries, making the product different in relation to flavor, aroma, and colors. There is also an interface between the know-how and the knowledge acquired from the courses, especially in the area of food handling, hygiene, and better production conditions, enabling greater productivity and resulting in a differentiated product.

In Table 5, the data referring to the participation in courses in the food area are presented, and the great majority of interviewees (93%) have already participated in some kind of course, among the most cited were Good Manufacturing Practices (42.9%), bakery courses (14.3%), and Hygiene/food handling (12.2%), demonstrating the importance of updating to improve production, besides providing safe food to the consumer's health, since

the food production process requires the fulfillment of rules that ensure the quality and greater safety of the food produced by any food enterprise.

Table 5 – Training and Courses taken by the 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Types of courses	Responses		Percentage of cases
	N	Percentage	
Good Manufacturing Practices	21	42.9%	60.0%
Beverages	1	2.0%	2.9%
Canned food	3	6.1%	8.6%
Strawberry cultivation	1	2.0%	2.9%
Dairy products	3	6.1%	8.6%
Candies	2	4.1%	5.7%
Hygiene/food handling	6	12.2%	17.1%
Vegetables	1	2.0%	2.9%
Bakery	7	14.3%	20.0%
Organic products	1	2.0%	2.9%
No course	3	6.1%	8.6%
TOTAL	49	100.0%	

Source: Research data

Note: The number of citations is higher than the number of agroindustries, due to the multiple responses.

The food production process requires compliance with rules that ensure the quality and greater safety of the food produced by any food enterprise. "The search for technical and conceptual knowledge is relevant for the success of family agroindustries in the competitive environment and in rural areas" (Anes, 2017 apud Schinaider et al, 2018, p. 23).

It is of utmost importance that the food that reaches the consumers' table daily is safe and preserves their health. Thus, the implementation of the Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) program that aims at providing safer food must be adopted by the family agroindustries. One of the questions in the questionnaire refers to the knowledge of the Good Manufacturing Practices in the 35 agroindustries, and according to Table 6, 30 agroindustries responded that they are aware of them, representing 85.7% of the sample. When asked about knowledge and importance of Good Manufacturing Practices, 85.7% answered affirmatively, considering GMP important.

Table 6 – Good Manufacturing Practices of the 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Knowledge of Good Manufacturing Practices	Frequency	Percentage	Do you consider Good Manufacturing Practices important?	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	85.7	Yes	30	85.7
No	5	14.3	No answer	5	14.3
Total	35	100.0	Total	35	100.0

Source: Research data.

In Table 7, it is shown that when asked about the reasons to follow GMP, 68% of the sample said that food safety is the main reason to follow GMP, which corroborates with the goal of GMP, which is a manual that brings the compliance of rules that ensure the quality and greater safety of food produced by any food enterprise.

Table 7 – Action to Good Manufacturing Practices and Important Attitudes of 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Reasons for following GMP			Percentage of cases	Important attitudes for agroindustry			Percentage of cases
	N	%			N	%	
Behavior change	1	2.40%	2.90%	Hygiene	30	41.70%	85.70%
Food safety	24	58.50%	68.60%	Product quality	2	2.80%	5.70%
Food handling	1	2.40%	2.90%	Goodwill	1	1.40%	2.90%
Quality	5	12.20%	14.30%	Use of PPE	22	30.60%	62.90%
Reliability	1	2.40%	2.90%	Personal cleanliness	4	5.60%	11.40%
Social awareness	1	2.40%	2.90%	Equipment cleanliness	5	6.90%	14.30%
Hygiene	2	4.90%	5.70%	Good quality raw material	2	2.80%	5.70%
Avoid contamination	1	2.40%	2.90%	Animal health	1	1.40%	2.90%
No answer	5	12.20%	14.30%	Food handling hygiene	4	5.60%	11.40%
				Maintenance	1	1.40%	2.90%
TOTAL	41	100.00%			72	100.00%	

Source: Research data.

Note: The number of citations is higher than the number of agroindustries, due to the multiple responses.

Still, in relation to Table 7, the respondents were asked about the important attitudes that the family agroindustries should have, and the answer about hygiene reached the highest percentage (47.30% of the answers), and out of the total sample, 97% of producers pointed this question. The use of PPE (personal protective equipment) was the second most cited option, (30.6%) of the answers and (62.9%) of the respondents. By strengthening these aspects of the quality of family farming products, it becomes possible to build a more positive image and add more value to the product.

As for the clarification of doubts regarding the production process, it was identified, according to Table 8, that access to the Internet was the most cited alternative, in 30.2% of the cases. In second place is Technical Assistance (27.9%). If the alternatives Technical Assistance, Emater, and Public Agencies are added, the total percentage is 37%, showing that these institutions are present in the agroindustries.

Table 8 – Source of Production Processes from the 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Source of Production Processes	Responses		Percentage of cases
	N	Percentage	
Search in Material	3	7.0%	8.6%
Internet	13	30.2%	37.1%
Technical assistance	12	27.9%	34.3%
Association	1	2.3%	2.9%
Emater	3	7.0%	8.6%
Surveillance	1	2.3%	2.9%
Other businessmen	2	4.7%	5.7%
City hall	1	2.3%	2.9%
Public agencies	1	2.3%	2.9%
No doubts	6	14.0%	17.1%
TOTAL	43	100.0%	

Source: Research data.

Note: The number of citations is higher than the number of agroindustries, due to the multiple responses.

4.4 – Characterization of the commercialization process of rural family agroindustries

One way to strengthen family farming is to add value to its products. This can occur in several ways, and the main ones are "related to the development and marketing of products that highlight the social character of family farming, the territory, flavor, and differentiated characteristics of the artisanal production process" (Batalha, et al, 2005, p. 3).

In this way, the family agroindustry becomes a strategy of social reproduction, in the search for more revenues and income complementation, by adding value to their products, providing jobs for family members, since they choose to transform the raw materials, they already produce (Pelegrini; Gazzola, 2008).

With respect to knowledge of production costs, the lack of knowledge regarding management techniques of the production process by family producers is one of the difficulties of the family agroindustry in the sample, since 71.4% said they did not know all the costs that involve production.

Regarding the basis for calculating the sales price, according to Table 9, the option with most answers is the cost of the product (48.8%), followed by the competition. This shows that there are difficulties to compose the sales price, since 71.4% of the producers declared not knowing the cost of the products, and Table 8 shows the cost of the product, followed by the competitor's price as the most used options to compose the sales price.

According to Gazzola (2017), one of the difficulties of the agro-industry owner is to manage the entire production chain (production of raw materials - processing - markets - business administration). It is important that the producer knows the financial flow of the agroindustry (investment in fixed capital, costs and expenses, gross revenue), to add value to his/her product, as well as to compete with products already existing in the market (Schinaider et al, 2018).

Table 9 – Basis to form the Sales Price of 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Calculation Basis of Selling Price	Responses		Percentage of cases
	N	Percentage	
Competition	10	24.4%	28.6%
Product + labor cost	1	2.4%	2.9%
Product cost	20	48.8%	57.1%
Total cost with tax	1	2.4%	2.9%
Prices offered by programs	7	17.1%	20.0%
Market value	2	4.9%	5.7%
TOTAL	41	100.0%	

Source: Research data.

Note: The number of citations is higher than the number of agroindustries, due to the multiple responses.

Table 10 shows the perceptions most pointed out by producers regarding the differential of the manufactured product. The most pointed characteristic is the taste of the product, with 30%, followed by the method of production and product appearance with 7% each.

Table 10 – Differential of products manufactured from 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Differential - Manufactured Products	Responses		Percentage of cases
	N	Percentage	
Product Appearance	7	10.0%	20.0%
Handmade product	4	5.7%	11.4%
Differentiated packaging	2	2.9%	5.7%
Production method	7	10.0%	20.0%
Hygiene	3	4.3%	8.6%
Good quality raw material	6	8.6%	17.1%
No risk of contamination	2	2.9%	5.7%
No preservatives	3	4.3%	8.6%
Organic	6	8.6%	17.1%
Product quality	7	10.0%	20.0%
Product taste	21	30.0%	60.0%
Healthy	2	2.9%	5.7%
Total	70	100.0%	

Source: Research data.

Note: The number of citations is higher than the number of agroindustries, due to the multiple responses.

The results reaffirm the findings in the study by Spanevello et al (2019), who identified that the options most marked by the respondents were: quality, taste, and appearance of the products, because they are produced in a traditional way, without the addition of chemicals, which guarantee their natural attributes.

Thus, the products coming from family agroindustries are differentiated by a set of ecological, social, cultural, handmade, nutritional characteristics, which are incorporated into the product, materializing the differentiation of these products, in an association with the

place of their production and the know-how of the producers or acquired from the competent institutions, which gives a peculiar flavor, appreciated by an increasing share of consumers (MDA, 2004).

As for the form of commercialization, it was verified that the sale via 'producer block' is the most used, about 70.7%, followed by 'individual firm' (14.6%) and in group society (9.8%), while only 2 agroindustries do not have a register, and sell informally.

Table 11 shows the main points and marketing alternatives indicated by the family agroindustries surveyed. Direct sales, institutional programs, and trade fairs are the main items mentioned. According to this information related to the main commercialization places, it becomes justifiable the great percentage of the sale with producer block (formalized sale), since the producers commercialize with the Institutional Programs.

Another aspect that can be identified regarding marketing is that the points are concentrated in the municipality itself, since most of them are sold at the fair (30%), directly to consumers (30%), institutional programs (26%), and supermarkets (13%).

Gazolla (2017) states that one of the difficulties is to expand local marketing and consumption networks, in small municipalities (scale up of the experiences).

Table 11 – Commercialization Sites of 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Commercialization sites	Responses		Percentage of cases
	N	Percentage	
Fair	30	30.3%	85.7%
Supermarket	13	13.1%	37.1%
Direct Consumer Sales	30	30.3%	85.7%
Institutional programs	26	26.3%	74.3%
Total	99	100.0%	

Source: Research data.

Note: The number of citations is higher than the number of agroindustries, due to the multiple responses.

The results identified in Table 11 reinforce the findings of Spanevello et al (2019), who identified a diversification of segments in the marketing channels of the family agroindustries surveyed, i.e., each agroindustry has more than one channel in which it markets its products, such as fairs, home sales, supermarkets, and schools, among others.

Matei and Silva (2015) also identified in their study that direct marketing is the most common form among these enterprises, valuing the sale in the establishment and in fairs, but also inserting the products in markets and stores.

The diversification in marketing sites, although concentrated only in the municipality, is a positive point, because it demonstrates the autonomy of farmers to choose the markets for their products since if they do not fit in one of the markets, there will be others to protect themselves in times of crisis (Hahn et al., 2017).

Regarding the branding of products, about 62% of family agroindustries have labeling for their products. This indicates that farmers have the perception of the importance of identifying their products, creating their own identity, in order to build consumer loyalty.

A study, applied to family agroindustries in the Missões region of Rio Grande do Sul, in 2017, identified that the owners made investments in label printing, in order to highlight the identity of the family agroindustry (Anes, 2017).

About the main difficulties in agro-industry activities, according to Table 12, the lack of labor and the construction/enlargement or adaptation of a suitable environment, and the lack of equipment were the most cited.

Table 12 – Difficulties in conducting the 35 family agroindustries (2015-2018).

Difficulties found	Responses		Percentage of cases
	N	Percentage	
Revenue adequacy	2	3.8%	5.7%
Working capital	1	1.9%	2.9%
Competition	1	1.9%	2.9%
Building the right environment	6	11.3%	17.1%
Creation of new products	1	1.9%	2.9%
Disclosure	2	3.8%	5.7%
Lack of equipment	4	7.5%	11.4%
Lack of labor	15	28.3%	42.9%
Insects	1	1.9%	2.9%
Irrigation	1	1.9%	2.9%
Legalization	1	1.9%	2.9%
Logistics	2	3.8%	5.7%
Standardization of raw material	1	1.9%	2.9%
Commercialization sites	2	3.8%	5.7%
Price of packages	1	1.9%	2.9%
Product pricing	3	5.7%	8.6%
Label	2	3.8%	5.7%
No difficulties found	1	1.9%	2.9%
Price of raw material	1	1.9%	2.9%
Quality of raw material	3	5.7%	8.6%
Lack of raw material	2	3.8%	5.7%
Total	53	100.0%	

Source: Research data.

Note: The number of citations is higher than the number of agroindustries, due to the multiple responses.

The study by Amorim and Staduto (2008) identified that out of the 40 agroindustries surveyed, 65% of the interviewees attributed the lack of resources and the high cost of the installation and maintenance of an agroindustry (mainly animal derivatives), the other 35% found other difficulties such as compliance with sanitary surveillance, maintenance of product quality, small-scale production, lack of machinery and equipment suitable for small agroindustries, high cost of packaging, and lack of raw material for the whole year, corroborating the findings of this research.

5 – Concluding remarks

This paper sought to characterize a group of family agroindustries in Western Paraná, the process of family agroindustrialization, from the constitution of the agroindustry, labor, potentialities, problems faced nowadays, legislation, production and origin of raw material, costs and prices, types of commercialized products, and other relevant data.

From the characterization of these rural family agroindustries, some common characteristics can be identified in most of the agro-industrial units, as cited by Bonamigo & Schneider (2007): agroindustries use little physical space for the manufacturing of products; the production of agroindustries is focused mainly on local markets; family members, in most cases, are involved in the production, showing that labor is usually family-owned, and production factors are based on farming practices.

One of the characteristics to be highlighted in these enterprises is that there is great relevance of the work and management by the family nucleus itself since only 22.9% of the sample hires outsourced labor. In agroindustries, according to Carvalheiro (2010, p.78), "the family has control of the means of production - land, work tools, and labor - and is the main responsible (but not the only one) for the work in the agroindustry.

The agroindustries characterized are made up of small rural producers who produce food of vegetal and animal origin (organic or not), as well as pasta and bakery products. These producers are micro and small entrepreneurs that offer products linked to the local culture.

The transformation of these products occurs in an artisanal way in small and medium-sized facilities. In its great majority, these are products with simple processing, but with significant potential to add value.

Most are legalized, as they sell to institutional programs, fairs, and the local market. It was found that the income from the agroindustry is the only source of income in only two cases. About the others, all the producers have other incomes. According to Mior (2005), family farmers seek to revalue their raw material as one of the essential components of their strategy for economic and social reinsertion, since this raw material is used to produce new products, making them small entrepreneurs.

The producers comply with the legal aspects, both from the sanitary as well as the environmental and fiscal points of view before the public regulatory bodies. They are aware of the good manufacturing practices, besides valuing the importance of hygiene and the use of PPE. The sanitary quality associated with the production process is an extremely important measure, and one that should gradually be introduced in all agribusinesses. By strengthening this aspect of the quality of family farming products, it becomes possible to build a positive image of these products before consumers.

With the set of companies studied and the comparison with other studies, it is possible to consider that the agroindustry is an important strategy for social reproduction and rural development of family farming, by generating income and diversifying activities. The continuity of the family agro-industry trajectory will depend on the capacity of farmers to maintain and improve this form of organization and, at the same time, strengthen regional insertion in new production chains.

The rural environment has been characterized as a potential challenge for the formulation of public policies and for the maintenance of sustainable agricultural enterprises. New ways of cultivating crops to obtain greater profitability can be a stimulus for the continuation of agro-ecological activities through family succession, as well as an attraction for new entrepreneurs.

References

ABRAMOVAY, R. **Paradigmas do capitalismo agrário em questão**. São Paulo: EDUSP, 2007, 294 p.

AMORIM, L.S.B.; STADUTO, J.A.R. Desenvolvimento Territorial Rural: a agroindústria familiar no Oeste do Paraná. **Rev. de Economia Agrícola**, São Paulo, v. 55, n. 1, p. 15-29, jan./jun. 2008.

ANES, C. E. R. **Pensamento instrumental e substantivo na dinâmica produtiva das agroindústrias familiares na Região das Missões – RS.** Tese (Doutorado em Desenvolvimento Regional) UNISC, Santa Cruz do Sul, 2017.

ANES, C.E.R. DEPONTI, C.M. AREND, S.C. As racionalidades instrumental e substantiva na dinâmica produtiva das agroindústrias familiares na região das Missões. **Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional.** G&DR • v. 14, n. 2, p. 107-132, jan/2018.

BATALHA, M. O.; BUAINAIN, A. M.; SOUZA FILHO, H. M. Tecnologia de gestão e agricultura familiar. In: SOUZA FILHO, H. M.; BATALHA, M. O. (Orgs.). **Gestão integrada a agricultura familiar.** São Carlos: Edufscar, 2005.

BASTIAN, L. WAQUIL, P.D. AMIN, M.C. GAZOLLA, M. Agroindústrias rurais familiares e não familiares: uma análise comparativa. **REDES,** Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 19, nº 3, p. 51 - 73, set./dez. 2014

BIOLABORE - **COOPERATIVA DE ASSISTÊNCIA TÉCNICA DO PARANÁ.**
Disponível em: <<http://biolabore.org/site/>>. Acesso em 15 ago 2019.

BONAMIGO, C. A.; SCHNEIDER, C. R. Revisitando a história: a revolta dos posseiros de 1957 no Sudoeste do Paraná. Francisco Beltrão: Grafisul, 2007. **Análise socioeconômica das agroindústrias da BP3 – marco III.** Março, 2018.

BRASIL, **Política Nacional de Agricultura Familiar.** Disponível em http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2004-2006/2006/lei/111326.htm. Acesso em: 20 mai 2019.

CARVALHEIRO, E.M. **A construção social de mercados para os produtos da agroindústria familiar.** Tese (Doutorado em Desenvolvimento Rural – Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul). Porto Alegre, 2010, 214 f.

CASAGRANDE, A. E.; DE SOUZA, E. B. C. Do planejamento ao ordenamento territorial: estudo da região costa oeste do Paraná. **Raega - O Espaço Geográfico em Análise,** 2013, 28: 67-85.

DEPONTI, C.M. Teoria social e o lugar da agricultura familiar na sociedade contemporânea: estudo analítico-comparativo das contribuições brasileiras ao debate. **Anais do XLV CONGRESSO DA SOBER - Sociedade Brasileira de Economia, Administração e Sociologia Rural,** 2007.

DOTTO, M.L.G.; PLEIN, C. HEIN, A.F. ZANCO, A.M.; FARIÑA, L.O. As alternativas para agricultura e a agroindústria familiar rural e as contribuições ao desenvolvimento rural sustentável (DRS). **Braz. J. of Develop.,** Curitiba, v. 4, n. 6, p. 3352-3370, out./dez. 2018.

FAO (2014a). **The State of Food and Agriculture - Innovation in family farming.** Rome, Italy, 161 pages.

GIL, A.C. **Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa.** 5. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2010. 184p.

HAHN, C. L. CASARIN, V.A. SANTOS, A.V. MIRANDA, R.L. ORTIZ, L.C.V. Análise de mercado dos produtos da agroindústria familiar: Estudo de caso do perfil do consumidor e do produtor Santo-Angelense – Rio Grande do Sul – Brasil. **Espacios,** v.38, n.21, p.5, Caracas, 2017. Disponível em:

<<http://www.revistaespacios.com/a17v38n21/a17v38n21p05.pdf>>. Acesso em: 17 dez. 2019.

GAZOLLA, M. **Conhecimentos, produção de novidades e ações institucionais: cadeias curtas das agroindústrias familiares**. Tese de doutorado. Programa de Pós-graduação em Desenvolvimento Rural – PGDR-UFRGS. Porto Alegre, 2012.

GAZOLLA M.; NIEDERLE, P.A.; WAQUIL, P.D. Agregação de Valor nas Agroindústrias Rurais: uma análise com base nos dados do Censo Agropecuário. **Revista Paranaense de Desenvolvimento**, Curitiba, n.122, p.241-262, jan./jun. 2012.

GAZOLLA, M. PELEGRINI, G. As experiências familiares de agroindustrialização: uma estratégia de produção de novidades e de valor agregado. **Ensaio FEE**, Porto Alegre, v. 32, n. 2, p. 361-388, nov. 2011.

IBGE: INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA. **Censo Populacional. 2010**. Disponível em: <<https://censo2010.ibge.gov.br/>>. Acesso em 12 fev 2020.

____ **Censo agropecuário: resultados definitivos** / IBGE 2017. Disponível em: <https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/periodicos/3096/agro_2017_resultados_definitivos.pdf>. Acesso em 02 abril 2020.

INCRA - Instituto Nacional de Colonização e Reforma Agrária. **Novo retrato da Agricultura Familiar: o Brasil redescoberto**. Disponível em: <<https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/biblioteca-catalogo?view=detalhes&id=26131>>. Acesso em: 02 jun 2019.

IPARDES, Instituto Paranaense de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social. **Perfil Avançado dos Municípios**. Disponível em: <http://www.ipardes.gov.br/index.php?pg_conteudo=1&cod_conteudo=29>. Acesso em 13 nov 2019.

____ **Caderno Estatístico do município de Céu Azul, 2019**. Disponível em: <<http://www.ipardes.gov.br/cadernos/MontaCadPdf1.php?Municipio=85988&btOk=ok>>. Acesso em 15 mai 2019.

____ **Caderno Estatístico do município de Entre Rios do Oeste, 2019**. Disponível em: <<http://www.ipardes.gov.br/cadernos/MontaCadPdf1.php?Municipio=85988&btOk=ok>>. Acesso em 15 mai 2019.

____ **Caderno Estatístico do município de Guaíra, 2019**. Disponível em: <<http://www.ipardes.gov.br/cadernos/MontaCadPdf1.php?Municipio=85988&btOk=ok>>. Acesso em 15 mai 2019.

____ **Caderno Estatístico do município de Matelândia, 2019**. Disponível em: <<http://www.ipardes.gov.br/cadernos/MontaCadPdf1.php?Municipio=85988&btOk=ok>>. Acesso em 15 mai 2019.

____ **Caderno Estatístico do município de Medianeira, 2019**. Disponível em: <<http://www.ipardes.gov.br/cadernos/MontaCadPdf1.php?Municipio=85988&btOk=ok>>. Acesso em 15 mai 2019.

____ **Caderno Estatístico do município de Pato Bragado, 2019.** Disponível em:
<<http://www.ipardes.gov.br/cadernos/MontaCadPdf1.php?Municipio=85988&btOk=ok>>.
Acesso em 15 mai 2019.

____ **Caderno Estatístico do município de Vera Cruz do Oeste, 2019.** Disponível em:
<<http://www.ipardes.gov.br/cadernos/MontaCadPdf1.php?Municipio=85988&btOk=ok>>.
Acesso em 15 mai 2019.

____ **Caderno Estatístico do município de São Pedro do Iguaçu, 2019.** Disponível em:
<<http://www.ipardes.gov.br/cadernos/MontaCadPdf1.php?Municipio=85988&btOk=Ok>>.
Acesso em 15 mai 2019.

KARNOPP, E. VOGT, O.P, BERNARDY, R.J, ETGES, V.E. Agroindústrias familiares no sul do Brasil: o território na perspectiva do desenvolvimento. **Revista de Desenvolvimento Econômico – RDE - Ano XVIII – V. 2 - N. 34 - Agosto de 2016, Salvador, BA – p. 666 – 684.**

MDA, Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário. **Programa de Agroindustrialização da Produção dos Agricultores Familiares – 2003/2006.**

MALUF, R. S. **Agricultura Familiar: multifuncionalidade e desenvolvimento territorial no Brasil.** Rio de Janeiro: Mauad, 2009.

MARCONI, M. A.; LAKATOS, E. M. **Fundamentos de metodologia científica.** 7. Ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2010.

MARSDEN, T. New rural territories: regulating the differentiated rural spaces. **Journal of Rural Studies.** N.14, n.1, 1998.

MATEI, A. P.; SILVA, L. X. da. Inovação, Agroindústrias Familiares e Sistemas Agroalimentares Locais na Serra Gaúcha. **Revista IDeAS,** v. 9, n. 2, p. 8-44, 2015.

MIOR, L.C. **Agricultores familiares, agroindústrias e território:** a dinâmica das redes de desenvolvimento rural no Oeste Catarinense. 2003. Tese (Doutorado Interdisciplinar em Ciências Humanas) - Centro de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2003

____ **Agricultores familiares, agroindústrias e redes de desenvolvimento rural.** Chapecó: Argos, 2005. 338 p.

PELEGRINI, G.; GAZOLLA, M. A agroindustrialização da produção como estratégia de reprodução social da agricultura familiar. In.: **Cadernos do Ceam/Estudos Rurais III / Flávio Borges Botelho Filho (organizador) – Brasília: Universidade de Brasília, Centro de Estudos Avançados Multidisciplinares, Núcleo de Estudos Agrários – v. 8. n. 32,2008.**

PLEIN, C. Capitalismo, agricultura familiar e mercantilização. **Informe Gepec,** Toledo, v. 14, n. 2, p. 96-111, jul./dez. 2010.

PREZOTTO, L. L. **Uma concepção de agroindústria rural de pequeno porte.** Revista de Ciências Humanas. EDUFSC. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Centro de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas. Florianópolis. n. 31, abr. 2002. p.133-154.

RAMOS, Pedro. **Propriedade, estrutura fundiária e desenvolvimento (rural).** V.15, N.43, São Paulo. 2001.

RUIZ, M. S. VENTURINI, V. CAMBERLIN, W. LYRA, J.R.M. UCHOA JR. P.P.M.

Agroindústria familiar de Londrina-PR. 2010. Disponível em:

<file:///C:/Users/Notebook/Downloads/1401-Texto%20do%20artigo-5413-1-10-20150706.pdf>. Acesso em: 01 Abril 2020.

SILVA, J.B. GILES, A. **Pronaf Agroindústria.** SDR/MA. Brasília, 1998. 48p.

SCHNEIDER, S. A presença e as potencialidades da agricultura familiar na América Latina e no Caribe. **Redes** (St. Cruz Sul, Online), v. 21, nº 3, p. 11 - 33, set./dez. 2016.

SCHINAIDER, A.D.; BEZERRA, G.J. SANTOS JUNIOR, L.E., ATIYEL, C. CAPISTRANO, M.O.W. **AGROINDÚSTRIA: CONCEITOS E RELAÇÃO COM O DESENVOLVIMENTO RURAL** Gestão e planejamento de agroindústrias familiares [recurso eletrônico] / organizadoras Daniela Garcez Wives [e] Daniela Dias Kühn; coordenado pela SEAD/UFRGS. – Dados eletrônicos. – Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, 2018.

SPANEVERELLO, R.M. DUARTE, L.C. SCHNEIDER, C.L.C. MARTINS, S.P. Agroindústrias rurais familiares (ARFs) como estratégia de reprodução socioeconômica da agricultura familiar nos municípios de Santo Augusto e Campo Novo – RS. **Redes** (Santa Cruz do Sul. Online), v. 24, n. 3, p.198-216, setembro-dezembro, 2019

TRENTIN, I.C.L. **O Pró-Rural 2000 como Política Pública de Combate à Pobreza Rural.** Porto Alegre: UFRGS, Dissertação de Mestrado do PGDR. 2001. 135 p.

VEIGA, J. E. ; FAVARETO, A. ; AZEVEDO, C.M.A. ;BITTENCOURT, G.; VECCHIATTI, K. ; MAGALHÃES, R. ; JORGE, R. **O Brasil rural precisa de uma estratégia de desenvolvimento.** Brasília: Convênio FIPE-IICA(MDA/CNDRS/NEAD), 2001. 108 p.

WANDERLEY, M.N.B. O campesinato brasileiro: uma história de resistência. **Rev. Econ. Sociol. Rural** [online]. 2014, vol.52, suppl.1, pp.25-44.

WESZ JR. V.J.; TRENTIN I.C.L. FILIPPI, E. E. Os reflexos das agroindústrias familiares para o desenvolvimento das áreas rurais no Brasil. **IV Congresso Internacional de La RED SIAL.** Argentina, Mar Del Plata, 27 a 31 de outubro de 2008.

WILKINSON, J. A contribuição da teoria francesa das convenções para os estudos agroalimentares: algumas considerações iniciais. **Ensaio FEE**, Porto Alegre, v.20, n. 2, 1999.

_____. A pequena produção e sua relação com os sistemas de distribuição. In: **Seminário Políticas de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutrición en América Latina.** Anais... Campinas – SP: UNICAMP.2003.

WILKINSON, J. **O estado, a agricultura e a pequena produção** [online]. Rio de Janeiro: Centro Edelstein de Pesquisas Sociais, 2008, 229 p.

*Recebido em 31/05/2023
Aprovado em 03/07/2023*