

Work and management of women in family farming: an analysis from feminist and gender studies

Trabalho e gestão das mulheres na agricultura familiar: uma análise a partir de estudos feministas e de gênero

Karolyne Marin Herrera¹ , Cristiano Desconsi² , Renê Birochi³ , Daniela Aparecida Pacífico⁴ 

¹ Laboratório de Estudos Rurais (LERU), Departamento de Zootecnia e Desenvolvimento Rural, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), Florianópolis (SC), Brasil. E-mail: karolyne.herrera@ufsc.br

² Laboratório de Estudos Rurais (LERU), Programa de Pós-graduação em Administração, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), Florianópolis (SC), Brasil. E-mail: cristiano.desconsi@ufsc.br

³ Programa de Pós-graduação em Administração, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), Florianópolis (SC), Brasil. E-mail: renebirochi@gmail.com

⁴ Laboratório de Estudos Rurais (LERU), Programa de Pós-graduação em Agroecossistemas, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), Florianópolis (SC), Brasil. E-mail: daniela.pacifico@ufsc.br

How to cite: Herrera, K. M., Desconsi, C., Birochi, R., & Pacífico, D. A. (2024). Work and management of women in family farming: an analysis from feminist and gender studies. *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural*, 62(3), e281922. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9479.2023.281922en>

Abstract: This article aims to reflect on the theoretical possibilities for studies on rural women at work and managing family establishments based on the contributions of gender studies and feminism. Thus, we review the theoretical path of gender and work in the rural environment to critically reflect on the concept of management, address the specificities of management in rural establishments, and, finally, indicate theoretical paths for understanding the management of rural women. The analysis identifies two facets of management: instrumental, from management, and emancipatory, intrinsic aspect of organizing. In the results, we argue that the organizing agencies carried out by women offer alternatives to undo the managerialism embedded in organizational processes, which makes women's performance invisible, thus enabling the emergence of new access routes to reposition the role of women in rural establishments. In conclusion, this new approach considers that the emancipatory and collective aspects present in women's organizing may indicate a new way to address the concept and practices of management.

Keywords: management, organizing, work, rural women, family farming.

Resumo: Este artigo objetiva refletir sobre as possibilidades teóricas para os estudos sobre as mulheres rurais no trabalho e na gestão de estabelecimentos familiares tomando como base as contribuições dos estudos de gênero e dos feminismos. Para isso faz-se uma revisão sobre o percurso teórico de gênero e trabalho no meio rural, para então refletir criticamente sobre o conceito de gestão, abordar as particularidades de gestão em estabelecimentos rurais e, por fim, apontar caminhos teóricos para compreensão da gestão de mulheres rurais. Ao longo da análise, identificam-se duas facetas da gestão, a instrumental, proveniente do gerencialismo (*management*) e a emancipatória, aspecto intrínseco ao organizar (*organizing*). Nos resultados defendemos que as agências do organizar realizadas pelas mulheres oferecem alternativas para desfazer o gerencialismo embutido nos processos organizacionais, que invisibiliza a atuação das mulheres, possibilitando, assim, a emergência de novas vias de acesso para reposicionar o papel das mulheres em estabelecimentos rurais. Concluímos que essa nova abordagem da gestão considera que os aspectos emancipatórios e coletivos presentes no organizar das mulheres poderão indicar um novo caminho para tratar do conceito e das práticas de gestão.

Palavras-chave: gestão, organizar, trabalho, mulheres rurais, agricultura familiar.



Introduction

This article aims to reflect on the theoretical possibilities for studies on rural women at work and managing family establishments based on the contributions of gender studies and feminism. Such approaches have allowed broadening conceptual reflections by covering the dimensions of domestic and care work, as well as highlighting new perspectives to examine productive work, whose tasks, routines, and definitions of those responsible for performing them are crossed by power relations between all family members, especially men over women (Paulilo, 2016). However, if the most recent scientific production on women in rural contexts presents important advances in the reflection on gender and work, the same does not occur regarding management, especially in the intersection of the fields of Organizational Studies with Rural Studies.

The effort to reflect on the relationship between gender, work, and management in family forms of production, on the one hand, stems from the latent need to reflect on the participation (or absence) of women in managerial processes of both productive and reproductive initiatives and, on the other, by the importance of reflecting on the knowledge produced on gender and work to pave the way to improve research on inequalities in rural contexts.

In this sense, we seek to highlight three convergent and common aspects of these themes, which structure the presentation of this article in four sections developed from a descriptive analysis based on studies and theoretical approaches in the fields of Social Sciences and Applied Social Sciences.

The first section of the theoretical foundation discusses approaches to gender and feminism from the work category, emphasizing the debate on the sexual division of labor. It highlights the gap that emerges from family forms of production, reproduction, and organization in rural areas, making visible the roles assumed by women.

The second section is devoted to management in family organizations in agriculture. We address the criticism of the dominant sense of the term *management* and the foundational assumptions that underlie it, *managerialism*, mobilizing the contributions of Organizational Studies.

The third section regards the treatment given to the management theme in agriculture, emphasizing family establishments. The specifics of this type of social and economic organization are outlined from other forms of organization, especially concerning business-type organizations. We seek to criticize the notion of organization in which people form a more or less autonomous cohesive unit and show that the term management commonly used for empirical analysis rarely reflects on its meaning, restricting in assuming its dominant meaning from the approaches of administrative and economic sciences.

As a result, we seek to establish interfaces between gender and management in family establishments, reflecting on theoretical and analytical paths that allow us to expand studies on the role played by women in management, transposing management to the productive and reproductive dimensions, and in line with and complementing studies on gender and work.

2. Theoretical Foundation

2.1 The Work of Rural Women

The primary contribution of gender and feminism approaches to studies on women in rural areas links critical reflection on the concept of work. They reflect the understanding of work beyond the sphere of production and problematize the division and hierarchy in the productive, domestic, and care work. In these terms, they fill a gap in understanding the specificities of

family forms of production, reproduction, and organization in the rural environment, making visible the roles assumed by women.

The place of women in the sphere of production emerged as a concern in the late 1960s. It was responsible for initiating feminists in the academic scene, as highlighted by Heilborn and Sorj (1999). This movement has driven an epistemological rupture in the understanding of work, as indicated by Torns (2008), especially by instigating the debate on domestic work. A little later, in the 1980s, the gender category played a crucial role in offering interpretations of social relations, conferring cultural and social meanings on differences between genders. These substantial changes culminated in the redefinition of perceptions of these differences. Therefore, it placed women in contexts of hierarchical and/or power relations, as defined by Scott (1995).

From these new perspectives, it becomes a consensus that, when it comes to women's work, it is essential to address the work done in the sphere of production, that is, work that generates income, and reproduction, which includes domestic work. In Rural Studies, the advancement of the debate on the concept of work, together with the use of the gender category, followed the theoretical tradition latent at the time and led to studies that extrapolated the analysis of the role of women in the family nucleus (Paulilo, 1976; Martinez-Alier, 1975; Stolcke, 1986), placing them as protagonists, that is, as an object of study, as attested by the survey done by Cordeiro & Scott (2007).

The analysis of the place of women led to studies on inequalities, with the sexual division of labor being a relevant factor in reproducing these inequalities. For Durán (2000), an axiological correlate is created when establishing a division in labor, that is, an attribution of capacities and values to each of the facets of work and the subjects of the prescribed social relationship, establishing the bases to support such a relationship. In this sense, the sexual division has two organizers: that of separation, when the work of men and women is differentiated, and that of hierarchy, when the work of men is considered more "valuable" than that of women (Kergoat, 2009). In this division, the man is responsible for productive work, and the woman is responsible for reproductive work.

Highlighting inequalities between men and women does not mean limiting research to denouncing these inequalities but affirming the systematic nature of such inequalities. The objective is to reflect and analyze the social processes used to hierarchize activities, which value productive activities more than reproductive ones.

In addition to the perceived inequality in work and the relegation of women to work in the sphere of reproduction, it is observed that the characterization of the work of women farmers in the productive sphere is recognized as "help", "complementary work", or "accessory work" (Paulilo, 2016). In addition, the relationship of subordination of women in the family hierarchy, guided by the sexual division of labor, results in their non-recognition, thus configuring the invisibility and non-recognition of the social and economic role of women. These themes have been frequent issues in discussions about the work and role of women in rural areas from the beginning of reflections in the late 1960s to the present day.

It is important to emphasize that the debate on the sexual division of labor in rural areas is specific since, unlike in cities, reproductive work is performed in the same place as productive work, that is, the rural establishment (Herrera, 2019b). Despite the transformations that have taken place in agriculture with the advent of capitalism, including the modifications in how the social and economic life of farmers has been structured, the family unit of farmers remains a unit of production and consumption.

There is an overlap between the spheres of production and reproduction due to the frequent involvement of the whole family in the execution of productive tasks since women and men usually do not move from their establishments to perform work. Some activities do not require women to move away from the home environment to perform productive tasks. Both types of work occur in the same sphere, often resulting in challenges for women to clearly distinguish the activities performed in their daily routines as belonging to the productive and reproductive spheres (Paulilo, 2004).

In this sense, some researchers have shown concern, especially since the 2000s, in exploring the understanding of the place of women in family production and reproduction, especially in domestic work, as indicated by the bibliographic surveys by Salvaro, Estevam, and Felipe (2012) and Maciazeki-Gomes, Nogueira and Toneli (2016). At first, more descriptive studies were observed, especially in the first decade of the 2000s, characterizing women's performance in the productive and reproductive spheres in different social and geographical contexts.

Expanding the discussion to a deeper understanding, the critical analysis of reproductive work and the description of the activities of women farmers contributed to highlighting that the concept of domestic work and the discussion on the sexual division of labor were insufficient to encompass the full complexity of the activities performed by women in the family. This is because the provision of care services is also included within the tasks performed in the sphere of reproduction. While domestic and care work studies were already common in urban settings, their adoption in understanding rural space occurred more recently, especially in the late 2010s.

Thus, a new tendency begins in analyses that extrapolate the mere problematization of work from the denunciation of inequalities and the description of activities. There is a concern with the articulation between productive work and social reproduction, such as the research of Moura and Moreno (2013) and Herrera (2019a), with particular emphasis on domestic and care work.

Domestic and care work consists of activities performed by one person, often a woman, for the benefit of others. These activities are directed to meet the physical, intellectual, affective, and other emotional demands of spouses, children, older adults, the sick, or people with disabilities. Despite being a component of reproductive work, care work is not equivalent to domestic work, although it often coincides with domestic activities (Boris, 2014). This covers traditional household responsibilities such as cooking, cleaning, washing, shopping, and essential personal needs, including bathing, feeding, accompanying, transporting, and treating illnesses. In addition, it is essential to highlight that housework and care activities inevitably also include services in the home environment in the rural context, such as caring for gardens, orchards, and small animals, since these elements are directly linked to the health and nutrition of families (Herrera, 2019a).

Therefore, the dialogue regarding the spheres of production and reproduction has advanced in recent decades and approached in two different ways: i) when considering the subordination of one sphere with the other; and ii) in the articulation between both spheres. In these analyses, themes such as domestic service, family care, motherhood, and sexuality begin to be questioned, leaving the scope of analysis that exclusively addresses farmers in their condition as rural workers.

The discussion about management appears only marginally despite the progress in reflecting on the place of women in production and reproduction, especially when gender inequality in decision-making is evidenced (Desconsi, 2021). The lack of analytical reflection on the topic opens space for inquiry into the management concept and how to apply it to the reality of women in family farming. As critical reflection on the concept of work was crucial to give visibility and recognition to women's work, we believe a similar path should be followed regarding the

management concept. Next, we explore the limitations of the management concept and, after reflecting on the management of rural establishments, present a proposal for an innovative approach to management focused on the analysis of the roles played by women in these environments.

2.2 The Limits of the Concept of Management

In this section, we seek to discuss the essential attributes that configure the concept of management originating from the Administration Sciences field to reflect on other theoretical contributions from Organizational Studies. The latter addresses the criticism of the dominant approach, managerialism, and indicates analytical opportunities to deepen the interdisciplinary debate on the management and work categories from new foundational bases and open space to relate the discussions regarding rural women and management.

The concept of management was built in the field of Administration Sciences to designate the specific attributions and responsibilities of organizational models that predominated in the twentieth century, based on epistemological assumptions oriented to the economy, founded on the *homo economicus* (Bourdieu, 1976, 2009). It is not by chance that the reflection on its meanings leads us to initially analyze it from the field of knowledge of the Administration Sciences and Economics. Generally, when other fields of knowledge, such as the Social and Agrarian Sciences, analyze the subject or import the assumptions and models conceived by management, examine management practices from other theoretical and methodological contributions without critically dialoguing with the categories of the field of administration, especially in Organizational Studies.

If, on the one hand, this makes it possible to highlight empirical issues concerning organizations in different social enclaves (Ramos, 1981), on the other, it imposes limits on interdisciplinary debate, unable to understand the organizational phenomenon in its diversity, scope, or interaction, that is, in dialogue with other disciplinary fields of knowledge. The term management derives from the knowledge constituted by skills and techniques aimed at producing effectiveness and efficiency, control and maximization of performance, oriented to objectives (Bertero, 2006), in a permanent decision-making process. For example, Peter Drucker is widely recognized as the modern founder of the term associated with the dominant use by the Administration Sciences: *management*. When analyzing Drucker's speech, Medina & Misoczky (2007) (our translation) identified "[...] the reinforcement of knowledge, beliefs, and values that contribute to the naturalization of neoliberal globalization".

In general or consensually, management in globalized capitalist societies constitutes a panacea for addressing the most diverse problems that all organizations face, be they business, state, civil society, or family.

In these contexts, the demand for professionals specialized in "management", that is, administrators who can lead organizations very different from each other, is common and frequent. Management emerges as the holder of the ability to solve various problems and achieve effective and efficient economic results (Parker, 2002; Böhm, 2006). This ability to transit indistinctly through singular and diverse spaces reveals some emblematic initiatives that surround the social construction of the term:

- i) The constitution and legitimation of a totalizing knowledge of social reality, which simultaneously generates new modes of knowledge. In short, an epistemology represented by the Administration Sciences, which produces and reproduces scientific knowledge accepted by a community of specialists who legitimize it, and a professional practice diffused

and reproduced by all spaces of social life. In this sense, management is an institution that focuses on modes of action in modern societies (Abraham, 2006; Rodrigues & Silva, 2019).
ii) The dominance of the business typology as a framework of technical knowledge, which extends to other organizational forms beyond companies, be they State organizations, civil society, or even the intimate space of the family. In this sense, the ideal type of organization characteristic of modernity is the company (Solé, 2004, 2008; Rodrigues & Silva, 2019), and its *modus operandi* is *management*.

Organization and organizing are amalgamated by *management*, which operates a kind of reduction of social processes subsumed in the business typology, making the diversity of different organizational worlds invisible. Its most visible facet, management, restricts the processualist aspect of organizing, evidencing it only as a technique. In turn, the organization-company is restricted in its structure and functions, as it is operated by devices and different power technologies. *Management* is a system of power organization (De Gaulejac, 2007) and thus constitutes part of the social imaginary of modern society. This social imaginary supports the exercise of domination (Castoriadis, 1986), of which we feel the effects but rarely identify its causes.

The field of knowledge of administration has produced several approaches shaped from the rationalization and specialization of administrative functions. The field's basic concepts, methods, and techniques are modulated based on the economic organizations (companies) inserted in the capitalist economy (Tragtenberg, 2010), predominantly focused on the industrial segment. They assume profit maximization in symbiosis with the neoclassical economics theories as the company's primary objective. Thus, organizational and managerial models developed for companies in the industrial segment have adapted to other economic sectors, maintaining the same principle. This was the case in the specific field of rural administration (Lima et al., 2005).

In Organizational Studies, criticism focuses on *managerialism* (Vizeu, 2010), indicating that such conceptions are functionalist and positivist from the epistemological perspective (Andion, 2023) and envisioning the need to strengthen the construction of knowledge in the field of administration with more theories that reflect and explain its practices (Bispo, 2022). The criticism falls on the perspective of *managerialism* since it is guided by technical and instrumental approaches and tends to naturalize the notion of organization as a synonym for company and management as a domain focused on solving problems. The manager guarantees this process by exercising control and coordination, focusing on performance (Andion, 2023). In these terms, the meaning of "managing" focuses on the development and application of techniques and instruments in the managerial process. The correct and up-to-date use of these techniques would presumably determine the success of the economic organization.

Thus, the managing function gains scientific contours, assuming the various principles proposed by Taylor, in which two stand out for the purposes of this article: i) separation between administrative and executive activities; ii) the business/company/productive segment must separate from the private/personal/family sphere. In the first plan, managing means being in a higher position in the hierarchy regarding executive assignments (understood in the work category) and having the authority to decide, coordinate, plan, and organize resources, people, and processes to obtain effective and efficient results. Second, it is assumed that the economic organization must be autonomous regarding the owners, managers, and workers' personal, private, and family aspects. The business must reproduce by itself, and the manager's decisions must be exclusively oriented towards this end.

As a rule, these principles remain active today but involve an organizational form when applied to the context of family farming where the business is directly related to the private

and affective, and the hierarchy between those who manage and those who execute is not reproduced in the same manner as conceived by the company organization. This leads us to highlight a first attribute associated with the term management that is rarely the subject of criticism: the position and legitimacy of male authority. Effective administrative or managerial actions mean the conformation of positions of authority in the upper spheres of the hierarchy in the organizational structure. In other words, someone who has the legitimacy to make decisions and the means to coordinate, organize, and control resources, people, and processes. In this attribute, it is worth paying attention to the mechanisms that give legitimacy to authority and, simultaneously, observing the possibility of examining the devices and artifacts mobilized for exercising control (Bourdieu, 2009). There is a tendency for the business management model as conception and practice and the family forms of production (although very diverse) to reproduce hierarchies and means of legitimation of men as superior to women.

The second attribute extracted from the meanings of management is in the unit on which it is effective: management refers only to the business or the productive aspect. This is why they say, "Run like a company". It uses the profit-seeking capitalist enterprise model, and its results are based on decisions and factors related to profit maximization for its owners. The attribute does not allow addressing administrative aspects beyond the limits of what is understood as the productive sphere or the business itself. If it makes sense for the analysis to focus on the economic organizations inserted in the markets, it may be insufficient for understanding managerial processes in family organizations, be they companies or other arrangements based on kinship and community ties. Their managerial processes could be better understood by paying attention to the articulations between the productive/business and reproductive spheres (group of people responsible and who benefit from the former).

2.3 Management in Family Farming

Several studies in the field of Administration and Rural Economy address management in agriculture, mainly when referring to family farmers, using these assumptions, as in the works of Holz (1994), Binotto (2005), and Zachow & Plein (2018), among others. This can be observed when considering that problems such as low productivity and efficiency or the level of insertion in markets result from the "lack of management" (Holz, 1994) or indicate that farmers do not use the models and techniques developed by the field of Administration in driving their properties to success in economic results (Binotto, 2005; Castro Neto et al., 2007; Deponti, 2014), even though they adopt different management styles (Thiago et al., 2020).

Under this perspective, management in agriculture refers to the business or productive sphere of the property or farm, which must be managed as a company. Even in studies on management in family farming, the focus falls on planning, strictly organizing the production system, and controlling its costs and resources to generate a production volume, mobilizing management technologies (Batalha et al., 2004). The systemic approaches inspired by agrarian systems call attention to the interrelation with the family but objectively emphasize it as a workforce, that is, within the scope of executive activities, a resource among others, understood around the agricultural unit (Dufumier, 2010; Lima et al., 2005).

At the same time, it should be noted that the construction of the peasantry and family farming categories took place, seeking to outline the specificities of this type of social and economic organization from the other forms of organization emerging in capitalist society, especially concerning business-type organizations. Wanderley (2003) indicates that there is a continuous clash between peasant rationality and the instrumental rationality promoted by

capitalist society in family farming, which ends up promoting a specific culture generated in the confrontation between the traditional and what is imposed by “models of economic and social behavior” (Bourdieu & Sayad, 2006, p. 59).

This path assumes an idea of social and productive organization, in which the work performed by members linked by kinship ties is central. Therefore, the organization aims at family members’ social and economic reproduction. The limit of this notion of organization camouflages the hierarchies, inequalities, and differences between the members, or when these are evidenced, they are understood as functions or positions that integrate a specific order of this type of organization (Desconsi, 2021).

If management is linked only to the sphere defined as productive, studies focus on managing the use of the family workforce (or family labor) and its availability as a resource mobilized in the so-called primary activities. What defines the business’s configurations and its productive dimension are generally those that generate greater volume, monetary value, and insertion in the market (Lima et al., 2005).

Many administrative activities must occur within the surroundings of one of the defining principles of the work category, ensuring its members’ economic and social reproduction. It means that people (with a degree of affinity and kinship) are articulated around needs - housing, security, affection, and food, among others - in addition to goals and desires. In these terms, medium and long-term management are relevant since they define cyclical movements of the individuals that integrate the organizations and the articulations produced between their members. This aspect theoretically outlines the specificity regarding management models based on *homo economicus*. It allows us to think that economic and social reproduction effectively allows us to examine the articulations between the productive and reproductive spheres.

However, before discussing these articulations, we highlight a double aspect intrinsic to the management category. This aspect is not merely reduced to the debate on the productive dimension or even concerns the perverse effects generated by the managerialist appropriation of management as a technique in family organizations.

By way of reflection, we can characterize management as having an instrumental facet, which serves the reproduction of domination and expropriation of value through the instituted power relations and the protection of the members of the organization and the family concerning the patriarchal logic and capital present in the organizations of capitalist societies. Thus, it is necessary to *play the game* to continue living. This means knowing and appropriating the management tools present in administrative functions for protecting and reproducing associated human life. On the other hand, management also has an emancipatory facet, making it possible to turn the tables by subverting the heteronomous relationships between management and dominant organizations. This means enabling new forms of management manifestation through organizing.

3. Methodology

This research employs typical methodological procedures in elaborating theoretical-empirical essays, namely, the establishment of argumentative positioning around a central theoretical thesis, presented and defended throughout the essay’s development. Mobilization of analytical categories to serve as an argumentative nucleus to support the central thesis.

We used a qualitative methodological approach based on descriptive analysis to investigate and characterize the empirical phenomena. A directed review of the literature (non-systematic review) was conducted to establish analytical categories for constructing the central theoretical

framework based on studies and theoretical approaches in Social Sciences and Applied Social Sciences.

The documentary corpus comprised the literature on Rural Studies related to feminist and gender studies, studies on management in family farming, and the knowledge of Organizational Studies.

The methodological choice allowed for obtaining detailed information, contextualizing the phenomenon over time, and providing a comprehensive view of its various facets. This provided a solid basis for descriptive analysis and allowed cross-validation of information from two fields of knowledge.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Management of rural women

In gender and feminist studies, it is common to point out inequality in the leadership statements of rural establishments (Hora et al., 2021) or bring empirical evidence of inequality in decision-making (Desconsi, 2021), envisioning the need for equality, especially concerning the management of financial resources to provide greater emancipation to women. However, reflections on inequalities mobilize the management concept in its managerialist sense.

Management is mobilized from its instrumental facet even in studies such as by Brandão et al. (2023), which analyze management from other rationalities, other than the exclusive orientation towards profit maximization, arising from solidarity economy principles. The concept of self-management is mobilized in the study mentioned above, focusing on the well-being of women farmers and their families. However, the administrative functions (planning, organizing, directing, and controlling) are highlighted in the empirical analysis even if another approach is adopted to analyze the role of women in managing a cooperative.

Despite the dominance of the term in its managerial sense, we do not disregard the positive effects of its use as a protector for women, who use the instrumental tools to face the subordinations imposed by capital and patriarchy. In the instrumental facet, management becomes a device for protecting and confronting patriarchal and capitalist social dynamics, especially regarding organizations' economic and productive aspects. However, reflecting critically on the management of rural women leads us to reflect on the two facets mentioned in the previous section: instrumental, from managerialism, and emancipatory, an intrinsic aspect of organizing.

It is known that the production system on which family productive work is based is recognized as a space of responsibility of man, giving him the necessary legitimacy to exercise his control over it, which involves decision-making on productive activity, management, and centralization of financial resources that will be generated there, reinforcing the notion of authority present in the figure of those who manage. Although there are some exceptions, such as the study by Fernandes & Mota (2014) on the autonomy of women in food marketing, the analysis of women's participation in the productive space is usually marked by the lack of female autonomy in decision-making in productive activity and property management, also configured by the frequent absence of land ownership and income as a counterpart to the productive work performed by them.

Therefore, having a decisive role or participation in instrumental management and decision-making is essential for women to be valued and gender inequalities to be overcome, given that women play an essential role in family farming (Paulilo, 2004).

We consider the mobilization of management's instrumentalist character, such as playing *the game* imposed by the dominant capitalist and patriarchal conceptions. This is revealed when we see, for example, the demand of women for occupying space in the productive initiatives of rural establishments, leading production and sales control activities, which can lead to a potential increase in decision-making and management power within the family, mainly because they access the income from this work by leading productive initiatives. Including women in productive initiatives sometimes represents the only perspective of recognizing their role.

Thus, in addition to establishing a greater balance in the control of initiatives on their properties, they seek to create and strengthen "new" productive initiatives that allow greater control and female protagonism, as in the experiences examined in the Santa Catarina by Reiter et al. (2019) on the artisanal agro industrialization of non-agricultural activities to provide services such as agritourism and crafts, or even establish the change from conventional to agroecological production systems, among others. Such experiences seem to have the potential to reduce gender inequality, making possible changes in the form of organizations that reposition the role of women in management and work in family farming.

However, *playing the game* has not proved enough to change the hierarchical structures in families and social structures, as indicated by Mota et al. (2020) on the responsibility of women from Pará in integration contracts with oil palm agroindustries. Therefore, it is necessary to uncover the aspect of management that values women's performance, as occurred with the epistemological rupture of the concept of work by feminists.

In this sense, we consider that approaching management through its other facet, that of organizing, allows *turning the tables* on dominant approaches, which do not allow visualizing the participation of women in management by focusing on productive activities.

The aspects of organizing are linked to the actions that transpose the productive aspect of the activities, allow considering the activities of the reproductive scope, and, more than that, consider those daily activities difficult to categorize in the dichotomous productive/reproductive separation. The sphere of organizing considers the interaction between the members of the rural establishment. Therefore, it has a negotiated character contrary to the unilinear character of managerialism, which is based on the supremacy of what is defined by the productive sphere or business over the reproductive sphere.

The analytical lens of organizing allows us to recognize the importance of women in synchronizing tasks and daily management of the needs of all family members and living beings (plants and animals) in the family establishment. This means that women place themselves with a permanent temporal availability, a relationship based on interaction, anticipation, and recognition of needs (Bessin, 2016). The most striking evidence of this process is the organization of labor time. They are involved in various activities that fill their daily lives; they do not live with the idea of the workday as the meaning of work linked to the business notion, that is, working hours with a beginning and an end. The management of women articulates production and reproduction, admitting to their routine a character of continuity without a definition of beginning and end.

Women are responsible for managing working time to reconcile people's needs, dividing their activities between domestic, care, and productive work. They are also invariably responsible for access to public or private services outside rural establishments, such as access to health, education, leisure, and community activities.

In addition, time management goes beyond the needs of people. It is necessary to perform the work planned for the day, plan garden and field crops, handle animals, and manage the entire production system. Women usually accompany, for example, the right day to plant the

seeds; they take care of the animals according to their needs, respecting their life cycle; and they organize the productive system according to the climate, seasons of the year, or soil condition. Good planning and efficient time management are essential for developing agricultural production and crops. Women also organize the family economy, constructing their calculation forms to ensure the care of family members based on income and other available resources.

This denotes the emphasis of care studies in the field; even if decision-making and management concerning productive activity begin from a managerialist conception, this type of decision considers the structure of care in the rural establishment (Herrera, 2019a). In this sense, the decision on the productive organization of the rural establishment is more complex than the simple, productive orientation. On the contrary, it is based on values and affections since social and cultural components are present in the decision-making process, which go beyond the mere productive rationality given by the appropriation of nature as a form of capital accumulation.

Alternative paths are created by mitigating the preponderance of managerialism in the organizational process, allowing other possible forms of *organizing* so that instrumental management is intertwined with emancipatory aspects invisible and subordinate to managerialism. The thesis proposed in this article is that the agencies of *organizing* performed by women offer alternatives to undo the managerialism embedded in organizational processes, enabling the emergence of new access routes to reposition the organizational phenomenon. This new approach considers that the emancipatory and collective aspects present in women's organizing may indicate a new way to address the concept and practices of management.

Therefore, it is necessary to move away from the concept of management to reflect on the management of rural women since it was conceived by the dominant approach of the field of *management* and analyze how studies on the peasantry and family farming have addressed the delimitation of the productive sphere in articulation with the reproductive sphere concerning the different forms of organizing.

To a large extent, the debate around the category work (productive work x reproductive work) outlined the analysis of activities in rural establishments, maintaining, when mobilized, the classic model of economic organization developed by the *management* of the administrative sciences, derived from the Taylorist separation between those who plan and manage work in relation to those who execute it.

In this sense, work means the execution of tasks, and it is exclusively up to the manager to decide or govern those who perform the work. Thus, practically any other possibilities of attributing value (economic or reproductive) to the activities linked to the category work in family organizations are excluded and hidden, remaining subordinate to the economic activities exclusively carried out by the property manager. Therefore, different forms of power and domination are reproduced by management, reinforced by the process of naturalization of the *management* (managerialism) that makes invisible the contradictions and antagonisms inherent in the use of the term management, focused exclusively on the technical aspects of *organizing*, which reifies social reality through the consecrated administrative functions (planning, organizing, directing, and controlling).

Conclusions

This article sought to present theoretical alternatives to analyze the studies on rural women at work and in the management of family establishments. These alternatives come from the contributions of feminist and gender studies and Organizational Studies, which polemicize with

the dominant conceptions of managerialism. Such approaches broaden current conceptual reflections by incorporating domestic and care work dimensions.

The analytical key proposed by this article aimed to deconstruct the dominant approaches inextricably linked to organizations and management, focusing on the valuation of the category “organize” as a structuring element of rural family organization (in its productive and reproductive aspects). In this sense, management is considered a horizontal and fluid process of collective action based on a new form of organization.

We highlight two facets of management that can be operationalized by a new theoretical contribution that emerges from the organization performed by women: an instrumental facet and an emancipatory facet. In this sense, alternative ways are created so instrumental management is intertwined with emancipatory aspects invisible and subordinate to managerialism.

The thesis proposed in this article is that the organizing agencies performed by women offer alternatives to undo managerialism, enabling the emergence of new access routes to reposition the organizational phenomenon. This new approach considers that the emancipatory and collective aspects present in women’s organizing may indicate a new way to address the concept and practices of management. New management forms imply changes and innovations in the organization of life, family, and economic activities to expand the possibility of rebuilding power relations based on gender inequality.

We emphasize that the theoretical-methodological contribution proposed in this article results from an ongoing research project aimed at empirical research to analyze the management of women where the organization of productive activities, the intimate life of the family, and social life manifest: i) the management of gardens; ii) the management of domestic space; iii) the management of productive space; and iv) the collective management of associations to which the family is linked. We intend to disseminate the results of empirical research in future publications.

References

- Abraham, Y. (2006). L’entreprise est-elle nécessaire? In J. Dupuis (Ed.), *Sociologie de l’entreprise*. Montréal: Gaëtan Morin Editeur.
- Andion, C. (2023). Reflexões epistemológicas e sobre o fazer científico da administração contemporânea. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 27(2), e230017.
- Batalha, M. O., Buainain, A. M., & Souza Filho, H. M. (2004). Tecnologia de gestão e agricultura familiar. In H. M. Souza Filho & M. O. Batalha (Eds.), *Gestão integrada da agricultura familiar* (pp. 43-65). São Paulo: EdUFSCar.
- Bertero, C. O. (2006). *Ensino e pesquisa em Administração*. São Paulo: Thomson Learning.
- Bessin, M. (2016). Política da presença: as questões temporais e sexuadas do cuidado. In A. R. P. Abreu, H. Hirata & M. R. Lombardi (Eds.), *Gênero e trabalho no Brasil e na França: perspectivas interseccionais* (pp. 235-246). São Paulo: Boitempo.
- Binotto, E. (2005). *Criação de conhecimento em propriedades rurais no Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil e em Queensland, Austrália* (Tese de doutorado). Centro de Estudos e Pesquisas em Agronegócios, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre.
- Bispo, M. S. (2022). In defense of theory and original theoretical contributions in administration. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 26(6), e220158.
- Böhm, S. (2006). *Repositioning organization theory: impossibilities e strategy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Boris, E. (2014). Produção e reprodução: casa e trabalho. *Tempo Social*, 26(1), 101-121.
- Bourdieu, P. (1976). Le champ scientifique. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 2(3), 88-104.
- Bourdieu, P. (2009). *O senso prático* (237 p.). Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Bourdieu, P., & Sayad, A. (2006). A dominação colonial e o saber cultural. *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, (26), 41-60.
- Brandão, T. F. B., Barbosa, L. C. B. G., & Bergamasco, S. M. P. P. (2023). Organização social e gestão associativa rural entre mulheres no semiárido sergipano. *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural*, 2(31), 1-20.
- Castoriadis, C. (1986). *A instituição imaginária da sociedade*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Castro Neto, M., Pinheiro, A. C. A., & Coelho, J. C. (2007). *Tecnologias de informação e comunicação na empresa agrícola*. São Paulo: Gazela.
- Cordeiro, R. L. M., & Scott, R. P. (2007). Mulheres em áreas rurais nas regiões Norte e Nordeste do Brasil. *Estudos Feministas*, 15(2), 419-423.
- De Gaulejac, V. (2007). *Gestão como doença social: ideologia, poder gerencialista e fragmentação social*. Aparecida: Ideias e Letras.
- Deponti, C. M. (2014). As "agruras" da gestão da propriedade rural pela agricultura familiar. *Redes*, 19, 9-24.
- Desconsi, C. (2021) *O controle da lavoura: a construção de relações sociais e a produção de soja entre assentados do meio norte do Mato Grosso – Brasil*. Campina Grande: EDUEPB.
- Dufumier, M. (2010). *Projetos de desenvolvimento agrícola: manual para especialistas* (2ª ed., 326 p.). Salvador: EDUFBA.
- Durán, M. A. (2000). Uso del tiempo y trabajo no remunerado. *Revista de Ciências Sociais*, 18, 56-69.
- Fernandes, T., & Mota, D. M. (2014). "É Sempre Bom Ter o Nosso Dinheirinho": sobre a autonomia da mulher no extrativismo da mangaba no Pará. *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural*, 52(1), 9-24.
- Heilborn, M. L., & Sorj, B. (1999). Estudos de gênero no Brasil. In S. Miceli (Ed.), *O que ler nas ciências sociais brasileiras (1975-1995)*. São Paulo: Sumaré/Anpocs.
- Herrera, K. M. (2019a). *A jornada interminável: a experiência no trabalho reprodutivo no cotidiano das mulheres rurais* (Tese de doutorado). Programa de Pós-graduação em Sociologia Política, Centro de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.
- Herrera, K. M. (2019b). Rompendo dicotomias: o cotidiano do trabalho das mulheres rurais. *Raízes: Revista de Ciências Sociais e Econômicas*, 39(1), 63-79.
- Holz, E. (1994). *Fundamentos teóricos da gestão agrícola*. Florianópolis: Epagri.
- Hora, K., Nobre, M., & Butto, A. (2021). *As mulheres no censo agropecuário 2017*. São Paulo: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Kergoat, D. (2009). Divisão sexual do trabalho. In H. Hirata, F. Laborie, H. Le Doaré & D. Senoiter (Eds.), *Dicionário crítico do feminismo* (67 p.). São Paulo: Unesp.
- Lima, A. J. P., Basso, N., Neumann, P. S., Santos, A. C., & Müller, A. G. (2005). *Administração da unidade de produção familiar: modalidades de trabalho com agricultores* (3ª ed., 222 p.). Ijuí: Unijuí.

- Maciazeki-Gomes, R. C., Nogueira, C., & Toneli, M. J. F. (2016). Mulheres em contextos rurais: um mapeamento sobre gênero e ruralidade. *Psicologia e Sociedade*, 28(1), 115-124.
- Martinez-Alier, V. (1975). As mulheres do caminhão de turma. *Debate e Crítica*, 4(5).
- Medina, I. P., & Misoczky, M. C. (2007). Peter Drucker e a legitimação do capitalismo tardio: uma análise crítica de discurso. *Gestão & Organizações*, 5(3), 260-283.
- Moura, M. C. D. & Moreno, R. F. C. (2013). A interdependência das esferas da reprodução e produção na produção de indicadores: reflexões a partir da experiência das mulheres rurais no sertão do Apodi. *Mediações: Revista de Ciências Sociais*, 18(2), 28-45.
- Mota, D. M., Nascimento, D. A. S., & Schmitz, H. (2020). Mulheres com contratos de integração para a produção de dendê no Pará: redefinindo relações de gênero? *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural*, 58(3), e192796.
- Paulilo, M. I. (1976). *O trabalho da mulher no meio rural* (Dissertação de mestrado). Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Paulilo, M. I. (2004). Trabalho familiar: uma categoria esquecida de análise. *Estudos Feministas*, 12(1), 229-252.
- Paulilo, M. I. (2016). *Mulheres rurais: quatro décadas de diálogo* (383 p.). Florianópolis: UFSC.
- Parker, M. (2002). *Against management: organization in the age of managerialism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Reiter, J. M. W., Mondardo, M., Ferrari, D. L., Mior, L. C., & Marcondes, T. (2019). *Os empreendimentos de agregação de valor e as redes de cooperação da agricultura familiar de Santa Catarina 2016* (72 p.). Florianópolis: Epagri.
- Ramos, A. G. (1981). *A nova ciência das organizações: uma reconceitualização da riqueza das nações*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas.
- Rodrigues, M. S., & Silva, R. (2019). Empresarização e modernidade: a ideia de empresa no centro do mundo. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Organizacionais*, 6(1), 40-76.
- Salvaro, G. I. J., Estevam, D. O., & Felipe, D. F. (2012). Mulheres e trabalho feminino rural: pesquisa no banco de teses da CAPES (1987-2010). In *Anais do III Seminário de Ciências Sociais Aplicadas*. Criciúma: Ed. UNESC.
- Scott, J. W. (1995). Gênero: uma categoria útil de análise histórica. *Educação e Realidade*, 20(2), 71-99.
- Solé, A. (2004). ¿Qué es una empresa? Construcción de un ideal tipo transdisciplinario (Working Paper). Paris.
- Solé, A. (2008). L'enterprisation du monde. In J. Chaize & F. Torres (Eds.), *Repenser l'entreprise: saisir ce qui commence, vingt regards sur une idée neuve*. Paris: Le Cherche Midi.
- Stolcke, V. (1986). *Cafeicultura. Homens, mulheres e capital (1850-1980)*. São Paulo: Ed. Brasiliense. 410 p.
- Thiago, F., Kubo, E. K. M., Pamplona, J. B., & Farina, M. C. (2020). Estilo de gestão de produtores rurais. *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural*, 2(58), 1-18.
- Torns, T. (2008). El trabajo y el cuidado: cuestiones teóricometodológicas desde la perspectiva de género. *Revista de Metodología de Ciencias Sociales*, (15), 53-73.
- Tragtenberg, M. (2010). *O capitalismo no século XX*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP.
- Vizeu, F. (2010). (Re)contando a velha história: reflexões sobre a gênese do management. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 14(5), 780-797.

Wanderley, M. N. B. (2003). Agricultura familiar e campesinato: rupturas e continuidade. Rio de Janeiro. *Estudos Sociedade e Agricultura*, 21, 42-61.

Zachow, M., & Plein, C. (2018). A gestão como característica da agricultura familiar. *Brazilian Journal of Development*, 4(6), 3318-3334.

Received: January 02, 2024

Accepted: April 26, 2024

JEL Classification: B54