

**AGROENTERPRISE COMMUNICATIVE PRACTICES:
AN ETHNOMETHODOLOGICAL STUDY OF ENTERPRISE
ENGAGEMENT OF RICE FARMERS
IN MIDSAYAP, COTABATO**

SYLVIA THERESE C. QUIRING

**Faculty of Information and Communication Studies
U.P. OPEN UNIVERSITY
2021**



**UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
OPEN UNIVERSITY**

Master of Development Communication

SYLVIA THERESE C. QUIRING

**AGROENTERPRISE COMMUNICATIVE PRACTICES:
AN ETHNOMETHODOLOGICAL STUDY OF ENTERPRISE
ENGAGEMENT OF RICE FARMERS
IN MIDSAYAP, COTABATO**

Thesis Adviser:
Jean A. Saludadez, PhD
Faculty of Management and Development Studies

07 June 2021

Permission is given for the following people to have access to this thesis:

Available to the general public	Yes
Available only after consultation with author and thesis adviser	Yes
Available only to those bound by confidentiality agreement	Yes

Student's Signature:

Signature of Thesis Adviser:

University Permission Page

"I hereby grant the University of the Philippines a non-exclusive, worldwide, royalty-free license to reproduce, publish and publicly distribute copies of this thesis in whatever form subject to the provisions of applicable laws, the provision of the UP IRR policy and any contractual obligations, as well as more specific permission marking on the Title Page."

"Specifically, I grant the following rights to the University:

- a) To upload a copy of the work in the theses database of the college/school/institute/department and in any other databases available on the public internet;*
- b) To publish the work in the college/school/institute/department journal, both in print and electronic or digital format and online; and*
- c) To give open access to above-mentioned work, thus allowing "fair use" of the work in accordance with the provisions of the Intellectual property Code of the Philippines (Republic Act No. 8293), especially for teaching, scholarly, and research purposes."*

SYLVIA THERESE C. QUIRING
Signature over Signature and Date

Abstract

This is a study on the worldview of rice farmers on agroenterprise, and their communicative practices. Using qualitative methodology, I analyzed empirical data from rice-based agroenterprise engaged farmers to answer the following research questions: What is the view of the farmers on agroenterprise, and How does their view define their communicative practices as entrepreneurs. Ethnomethodology was chosen as the research framework of this study for its ability to examine the contextual use or conduct of mundane activities enabling researchers to have specified data on practice. Though this specified ability of ethnomethodology may limit the application of the findings, it could be compensated for its capacity to observe and retrieve knowledge and skills in day-to-day activities. I found out that the rice farmers see their agroenterprise venture as an advanced farming activity, and this advanced farming activity is communicated through their three main practices of Financial preparedness and acumen developed; Farming practices enhanced, and Filial obligations accomplished. Financial preparedness and acumen developed is broken down into Saving is essential, Farm diversification for multiple sources of income, and Practical entrepreneurial knowledge and skills are used. While Farming practices enhanced is further defined by the rice farmers as Record-keeping improved farm management, and Appropriate farming technologies are applied. As an advanced farming activity, these agroenterprise communicative practices are the necessities by which other rice farmers may need to accomplish to engage in entrepreneurial activities. Based on the findings of this study, I came up with methodological and practical recommendations on the implementation and conduct of agroenterprise-based extension initiatives.

Biographical Sketch

I am currently a researcher at the Philippine Rice Research Institute – Midsayap Branch (PhilRice Midsayap). I lead and assist in various extension activities aimed at promoting cost-reducing and efficiency increasing rice and rice-based production technologies in PhilRice Midsayap's area of responsibility which include Region IX, XII, and the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao. My interests include the design and production of knowledge products, packaging of technology, and science communication.

Acknowledgment

“If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God.” James 1:5

The researcher wishes to thank the following for being God’s instruments in the accomplishment of this study:

Mam Jean Saludadez, for ushering her into the wonderful world of qualitative research, and for imparting her wisdom;

Sir Alexander Flor and Mam Melinda Lumanta for their inputs which made this study more insightful;

Ms Gina Hassan, for introducing her to UPOU, may she smile from heaven seeing the author finally finish her degree;

Ms Evelyn Tabelin for her dedicated work on rice-based agroenterprise which deeply stirred the context of this study;

The PhilRice Midsayap RiceBIS team for facilitating the interviews with the farmer-participants;

The farmer-participants for sharing their life stories and time, and to the rice farmers for being the inspiration of this study; and

All others who have in some way or another contributed to this feat.

To God be all the glory.

*Dedicated to my father,
Mr. Procopio Aranas Quiring.*

Table of Contents

		Page
Title Page	ii
University Permission Page	iii
Acceptance Page	iv
Abstract	v
Biographical Sketch	vi
Acknowledgment Page	vii
Dedication Page	viii
Table of Contents	ix
Chapter 1	Rationale	13
Chapter 2	Research Framework	17
	Ethnomethodology in the study of communication and agroenterprise	17
	Ethnomethodological studies on communication and enterprise	24
	Research Questions	28
	Objectives of the study	29
Chapter 3	Review of Literature	31

	Rice-based Agroenterprise in the Philippines	31
	Farmers' engagement in agroenterprise	35
	Communication in the Enterprise/Agroenterprise Context	37
	Exploring rice farmers' engagement in agroenterprise through communication	46
Chapter 4	Methodology	48
	Ethnomethodological tenets in the study of communication and agroenterprise	49
	The Researcher as the Research Instrument	53
	Participants and Site Access	54
	Data Collection and analysis	55
Chapter 5	Results and Discussion	58
	Farmers' View: Agroenterprise is an advanced farming activity	58

Agroenterprise Communicative Practice 1: Financial preparedness and acumen developed	61
Subtheme 1.a. Saving is essential	64
Subtheme 1.b. Farm diversification for multiple sources of income	67
Subtheme 1.c. Practical entrepreneurial knowledge and skills are used	70
Agroenterprise Communicative Practice 2: Farming practices enhanced	72
Subtheme 2.a. Record-keeping improved farm management	74
Subtheme 2.b. Appropriate farming technologies are applied	76
Agroenterprise Communicative Practice 3: Filial Obligations accomplished	80
Situating the empirical results to the theoretical/analytical framework	85
Agroenterprise worldview and communicative practices set in ethnomethodological tenets	86

Chapter 6	Conclusion and Recommendations	93
	Summary	93
	Conclusion	97
	Recommendations	98
	Practical Applications	98
	Mind-setting and Preparedness Coaching on Agroenterprise	99
	Tailored than mantle approach	100
	Enhanced farmer-to-farmer engagements	100
	Methodological Recommendations	101
	Use of qualitative research	101
	Review of previous agroenterprise- based intervention implementation	102
References		103

Chapter 1

RATIONALE

Communication cannot be overlooked as a component of sustainable agriculture (Walter, 1992). In agriculture, communication mainly facilitates the transfer of technology through various modes to improve productivity. However, in the evolving agricultural landscape, communication needs to step up from being unilateral, meaning researcher to the farmer, to be more communal in such cases as farmer-to-farmer interactions. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization, farmers' indigenous knowledge, their experience in doing research (often dealing with multiple variables and risk considerations), and their capacity to share information are crucial assets. Walter (1992) also said that communication is a key element in agricultural research and practice. It has become a virtual truism in sustainable agriculture circles that research must not only be multidisciplinary but must also involve farmers themselves in designing and conducting research according to their knowledge.

Farmers are not isolated individuals. They are part of multiple social networks, and in that context are likely to communicate, directly or indirectly with a variety of actors (Leeuwis, 2004). What makes studying farmers' communication practices valuable is that it uncovers tacit knowledge in life and farming. Agriculture is one of the major pillars of society, and as key players in this field, these actors (farmers) have much to share on their practice and performance of the practice, and their insights could serve as guidance in agricultural extension works. Certainly, in the

context of rural development, nothing is more important than the transfer of useful ideas from one person to another (Chauhan, 2007). Through communication, useful ideas, skills, or acumen can be transmitted from extension worker to farmer, or farmer to farmer. However, as communication is symbolic, knowledge and skills could be further decoded and improved through knowing how farmers make sense or view the context since in farming, there are different ways of doing things right (Leeuwis, 2004).

In contrast, Leeuwis (2004) also said that communication for innovation scientists and practitioners have long supported the idea that there was one 'right' direction in which farming should develop. Such an approach does not do justice to the existing diversity and runs the risk of failing to capture promising development opportunities. Thus, this study sought to provide an empirical view of farmers on agroenterprise and their agroenterprise communicative practices as there is now a growing cognizance on agroenterprise for to ensure that farming remains a lucrative venture, there should be a mindset shift from a traditional perspective of agriculture of production to a market-centric agribusiness model (Baticados, 2018). Through the conduct of this research, approaches in agroenterprise-based initiatives may be improved by knowing the worldview of the farmers on agroenterprise which will serve as the foundation for extension works.

Agroenterprise is defined by the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) as a means of refocusing production-based efforts within a market-based framework. It does not replace traditional agricultural development, but it does require a new way of thinking about agriculture: one that recognizes the market as the driver in the system and

requires that investments be aligned with market needs and evaluated against market performance—i.e., sales volumes, product quality, profit, and timeliness (CRS, 2009). This new way of thinking is being introduced to farmers through extension programs by various government and non-government organizations. Presenting this mindset to the farmers considers that agricultural business is risky with unstable incomes, farm economics differs from most other businesses, and farming is a way of life (Hennon, 2012). Shifting from being the producer to becoming the entrepreneur requires a lot from the farmers, but the central transformation happens in the mind as their understanding of engaging in agroenterprise will result in their actions.

Entrepreneurship research is attracting increased attention. Specifically, calls have surfaced to place researched enterprises within their natural settings to understand their origin, forms, functioning, and diverse outcomes (Chalmers and Shaw, 2017). In the agricultural context, agroenterprise as an emerging endeavor need to be studied to establish an effective strategy on how it could be better introduced, promoted, and adopted by farmers. Since the current development intervention is based on research, this study may provide empirical data on the conduct and implementation of agroenterprise.

Much has been written on ushering the farmers to agroenterprise which are mostly framed by a source to receiver connection (Saludadez, 2020), however little is known on how the farmers make sense out of such experience, and how it defines their actions. Through employing the ethnomethodology framework, this study aimed to bridge the gap, and gain knowledge on agroenterprise through the farmers' eyes.

Ethnomethodology is not so much interested in the notion of communication as the transmission of messages, but rather, 'communication' is seen, or 'respecified' in terms of how people interact with others in society. That is, what people say and how they say it is understood in terms of the activities accomplished in and through interaction (Butler, et. al., 2011). Studying agroenterprise through communication is important because communication is symbolic. Words that make up our language systems do not directly correspond to something in reality. Instead, they stand in for or symbolize something (University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing, 2013). This symbolism in words allows the expression of the tacit and common knowledge of a certain context. It is only through exploring communication that these features and acumen are uncovered. Aside from word symbolism, communication also enables actors to accomplish their performances. Communicating is a life-long experience of message exchange, and a conduit for the conduct or practices which are essentially patterns of human actions or regular activities (Leeuwis, 2004). These practices evolve into performances that are local and unique interaction events (Lindlof and Taylor, 2017). Performances are collaborative, and their significance is negotiable, hence the need for communication. Since humans conceptualize their actions at different levels (Lindlof and Taylor, 2017), communication is needed to make sense of the symbols used by actors for better interaction.

Chapter 2

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

Unlike other communication studies whose focus are more on medium, messaging or information systems in agriculture; and other enterprise or agroenterprise research that dwell on the adoption of enterprise by farmers, this study aimed to produce empirical data on the rice farmers' practice of agroenterprise. Using Ethnomethodology, I explored the lived experiences of select rice farmers to come up with themes that answered the research questions

Ethnomethodology in the study of communication and agroenterprise

Qualitative approaches to human communication may provide more insights and different insights than quantitative approaches (Treadwell and Davis, 2019). As mentioned in Chapter 1, communication is symbolic. This trait allows for the accordance of meaning as practiced in various contexts. Hence, the employment of a qualitative approach is suitable for the study of communication. Qualitative communication research involves the performances and practice of human communication. By performances, we mean expressive communication where immediacy and skill transcend the status of the message as transparent vehicles of information (Bauman, 1986 as cited by Lindlof and Taylor, 2017). In the study of agroenterprise where data may be sourced from various quantitative agroenterprise, the application of qualitative approach offers a fresh perspective in seeking

knowledge. And using communication as the lens by which agroenterprise will be explored, I deemed employing the qualitative approach as the better choice.

The different traditions of qualitative research have the same intention: Understanding meaning; however, each of them has a different assumption of where meaning is located; for ethnomethodology, it is in the practice...what people do, rather than what life is (Saludadez, 2016 cited by Segumpan, 2018). In this study, I looked into the practice of agroenterprise by select rice farmers who were introduced to the concept, established their enterprise, and sustained it. In looking for and understanding the worldview of the rice farmers on agroenterprise, I subscribed to ethnomethodology's focus on the examination of the everyday ways (methods) of sense-making of people (members, or members of society) as they produced the reality of their everyday existence. This is sometimes referred to as an interest in members' "practical action and practical reasoning" (Hester & Francis, 1997, p. 97 cited by Davidson, 2012). Rawls (2002, cited by Marcon & Gopal, 2008) provided the following definition of the term: "Ethno" refers to members of a social or cultural group and "method" refers to the things members routinely do to create and recreate the various recognizable social actions or social practices. "Ology" as in the word "sociology" implies the study of, or the logic of, these methods. Thus, ethnomethodology means the study of members' methods for producing recognizable social orders.

Ethnomethodological research displays a strong commitment to the study of social order within naturally occurring events. Particular attention is drawn to how everyday activities are routinely accomplished according to the rules, maxims, and

strategies that practical reasoners use to organize communication (Tsourvakas, G., 1997). Its distinct "topic" is the local construction of meaning through certain interactional practices, mostly conversational (Sacks, 1963 cited by Tsourvakas, G., 1997). Having been introduced to the concept of agro enterprise and experiencing its progression, farmers may have now created their meaning for the term. Unlike the definition from the World Bank and CRS (as presented in the previous chapters), this view on agroenterprise is based on their practice which may differ from what was prescribed to them but more importantly, it is what works for them.

Before I explain ethnomethodology further as used in this study, I will be presenting various concepts on it from related studies. These studies are also explained in-depth in the succeeding section but will be included in this part to provide a wider understanding of ethnomethodology.

Trace (2015) stated that ethnomethodology provides a model of the social world in which people act as if documents "are something rather than as seen as something". In his study of documents in everyday life using ethnomethodology, he highlighted the role of documents not as objects in everyday life but as tools by which data and information are transferred. Using ethnomethodology, he discovered that the production of documents is based on the process owner's culture, thus reflected in the output. In his finding, I learned that ethnomethodology allows researchers to examine the origin of documents, practices, and other actions, hence allowing for understanding not only of the results but also the basis by which these results were constructed. He also concluded that ethnomethodology tells us that the "natural attitude" (members' sense of the objective reality of social facts) is an

ongoing accomplishment. Ethnomethodologists study of the sense-making methods, and how they are deployed in action is centered on instances where people are making distinctions to decide on a course of action. This finding tells me that ethnomethodology focuses on the "contextual" use, practice, and consumption of mundane things. It provides for an understanding of specific meaning accorded to actions that are rooted in the worldview of the actor. Trace (2015) completes his study by sharing that ethnomethodology encourages us to reframe our analysis so the rules of conduct are not treated as a resource but as a topic for research. In doing so, ethnomethodology leads us to study how members make sense of the rules and the ways that members account for their actions by referring to rules. I agree with his conclusion that research should shift from a generalist perspective to a more specific or contextualized view. I think, to produce research results that could have an impact, it is important to look into details of daily life to determine factors that affect social order which eventually will contribute to the accomplishment of big tasks.

Ten Have (2004) also shares the same notion on ethnomethodology as he states that in ethnomethodological analysis, the researcher attempts to discover the specifics of how social action takes place contextually. He adds that ethnomethodology moves to specificity by consciously noting the procedural aspects and steps in observation and observer reaction to the observed. For me, this means that perceiving the minute details of social action and intervention plays a major role in the conduct of ethnomethodological research. And the ability to catch these particulars allows the researcher to have a better understanding of the bigger view that they comprise.

This “specified” quality further suggests that the roles and identities that individuals construct through everyday interaction shape and are shaped by the contextual constraints that emerge and dissipate during an interaction. As social action is continually accomplished, ethnomethodology allows the capturing of data and information as it happens which can contribute to a richer body of knowledge of the topic under study through its ability to observe and retrieve knowledge and skills in ordinary daily activities (Danby et. al., 2013).

By understanding the application of ethnomethodology in previous studies and knowing the researchers' experience of employing such a research framework, I can better explain why I chose the framework for this study as presented in the next paragraphs.

The rice farmers' practice of agroenterprise creates a new social order for them. Using their local knowledge and skills, they create their own "practical action and practical reasoning" (Hester & Francis, 1997, p. 97 cited by Davidson, 2012) in the conduct of their new venture. Since my interest lies in discovering the worldview of the farmers on agroenterprise through the communicative lens, the ethnomethodological framework is the most suitable guide by which I can delve into the lived experience of the rice farmers' daily tasks of accomplishing their agroenterprise agenda. As mentioned in the previous sections, communication is symbolic and provides the platform by which human performances may be examined. Another facet of ethnomethodology which prompts me to choose it as the framework of this study is its focus on the mundane accomplishments of tasks. Since I am after the worldview of the rice farmers on agroenterprise, I thought it was best to

discover their accomplishment of daily tasks to understand their practical action and practical reasoning" (Hester & Francis, 1997, p. 97 cited by Davidson, 2012).

According to Filmer et al. (1972 cited by CRS), by exposing the provisionality of the rules and schemas governing personal interaction, and detailing how they were continually recreated and reaffirmed in everyday social encounters, Garfinkel presents 'ordinary' people as the true architects of social order and social change. This suggests that the farmers' construction of their reality with regards to agroenterprise is exhibited in their everyday sense-making and cannot be separated from it. Thus, they create their distinct social order to carry out their entrepreneurial activities.

As stated in Chapter 1, entrepreneurship research has attracted attention, but the knowledge sought required it to be explored in its ordinary setting to understand its origin, forms, functioning, and diverse outcomes. This entailed refocusing the investigation to its practice (Chalmers, D. M, & Shaw, E., 2017). Studying the practice led to investigating the social order created through the accomplishment of tasks and other mundane activities. Ethnomethodology's focus on everyday social encounters and premium on ordinary people as architects of social order and change is in line with what I would like to accomplish through this study. Going after empirical data on the rice farmers' practice of agroenterprise, this focus on the practical schema of social order allowed me to explore and understand the rice farmers' construction of their agroenterprise social order.

As farmers construct their social reality in the context of agro enterprise, they have now become accountable for making it and keeping it in order. Thus, they formulate general rules, statements, practices, or procedures used in the constitution of local social orders and the structure of everyday experience (Zagado, 2013). This practical reasoning in which people engage depends upon their use of situational resources in specific contexts. The meanings of most, if not all, utterances would be unfathomable if we did not know the contexts in which they are spoken (Dore & McDermott, 1982 cited by Tsourvakas, G., 1997). This implies that the expression of social order varies on farmers' engagement on agroenterprise and thus has a universal meaning depending on the depth of their engagement exhibited through communication.

Going after the worldview of the farmers on agroenterprise, I was also determined to discover and understand their agroenterprise communicative practice. Since in ethnomethodology, the meaning lies in the practice, I was keen on knowing the statements and phrases they use to describe their practice of such enterprise. Through in-depth interviews under the ethnomethodological framework, I was able to discover their agroenterprise communicative practices which are anchored in their worldview of agroenterprise. Exploring agroenterprise through communication using ethnomethodology was possible due to its (ethnomethodology) putting a premium on the creation of social order through utterances that are spoken in the context of the new venture. In the case of this study, marrying the discussions in the previous sections, the new social order created is the rice farmers' practice of agroenterprise and the utterances which are spoken of the context are their agroenterprise communicative practices. As the owners of this social order, they set their own rules

on establishing and maintaining this social order which should be accomplished for sustainability. These rules and tasks are carried out through communication in their everyday lives. Communication in this sense is not only limited to the spoken word but also the performance of the tasks itself which are immediate transmitters of information to others thereby communicating the notion of agroenterprise.

Ethnomethodological studies on communication and enterprise

Aside from presenting ethnomethodology as the research framework of this study, I also included the following related studies which employed the same framework in exploring enterprise and communication. To gain a better understanding of the framework, I briefly discussed these literatures with emphasis on how ethnomethodology became the tool by which these were accomplished. These were earlier presented in defining ethnomethodology and looking at its unique qualities.

Chalmers and Shaw in 2017 studied the endogenous construction of entrepreneurial contexts from a practice-based perspective. They emphasized that to understand entrepreneurial context, the focus should be shifted to its practice, thus ethnomethodology was chosen as one of the frameworks of their research. According to them, every day, often mundane activities people do to get their work done to constitute the foundations of social order and institutions. They further highlighted according to Hayck that aloofness from practical knowledge has implications for understanding the dynamic functioning entrepreneurial contexts.

Employing Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis for an endogenous study allowed them to investigate the sites of the practice. Data for their study was derived from the recorded business pitches which were transcribed using Gail Jefferson's Conversation Analysis transcription convention, then analyzed. Using the transcriptions and recorded business pitches, Chalmers and Shaw (2017) were able to identify indexical expressions and gestures in the communication activities of the participants. The documentary method of interpretation was also seen as since the subject is business or enterprise, there is contrast and comparison in the presentations of the participants.

They concluded that entrepreneurial contexts are the concern of entrepreneurial actors and those with whom they interact with. They resolved that the ethnomethodological stance offered a solution to the methodological puzzle of their paper since they have presented a means for empirically demonstrating the consequentiality of context for episodes of entrepreneurial practice. They further set that ethnomethodology and conversation analysis provided the theoretical apparatus that offered insights into the role social settings play in the formulation of entrepreneurial conduct.

Chalmers and Shaw's (2017) findings through employing ethnomethodology as their framework provided support in my choice to employ the same framework in the study of the worldview of rice farmers on agroenterprise. Since I am after empirical data on the meaning accorded by the rice farmers on their practice of enterprise and how it affects communicative practices, through ethnomethodology I was able to see the effect of having such a worldview of the rice farmers in their

agroenterprise communicative practices. And since the data of this study is practice-based which is heavily set in the society wherein the rice farmers conduct their enterprise, I was able to better understand how farmers make sense of their lived experience as entrepreneurs through communication.

Another study conducted by Trace in 2015 tackled the use of ethnomethodology in gaining deeper insights into the relationship between people and recorded knowledge. His paper looked into studying people's actions as a type of document which served as evidence pointers to underlying patterns that makes interaction possible. The documents or written records he studied spanned from medical records to police blotters.

He found out that ethnomethodology highlights the fact that people transform their experiences and that of others into documents to facilitate actions and inferences. He further explained that ethnomethodology highlights that the correct reading of documents rely partly on the understanding of the tacit ideologies of people's sense-making which are used to get things done and make decisions. His study provides how the ethnomethodological framework allows the exploration of everyday life through documents.

Trace's (2015) study made use of the ethnomethodological tenet of the documentary method of interpretation to make sense out of the practice of documentation. However, since his paper focused on written accounts, the tenet was taken literally as in making a document out of an experience to serve as the basis for reference and benchmarking. In the context of this study, this tenet may not be taken

literally as in the case of Trace (2015). The documentary method of interpretation may make use of imagery in the mind which will serve as the document by which comparisons may be done or serve as a guide in making decisions. The caveat of this imagery documentation is that people rely heavily on their stock knowledge and the correctness in reading may be compromised as everyone have their interpretations. Nevertheless, the findings of Trace (2015) supported my subscription to ethnomethodology as this study's framework facilitates the understanding of the meaning behind the actions or practices of actors in accomplishing their mundane tasks.

Another interaction study using ethnomethodology and conversation analysis was made by Danby et. al. in 2013 on the use of young children of digital technologies at home. Daily interactions of select parents and children were recorded and then transcribed and analyzed to form the data of the study. They found out that aside from knowledge gained from theories of development, the interaction of children can be studied through their normal and routine everyday activities. Through ethnomethodology, orderly actions were identified that gave insight into the culture of knowledge and skills as observable and retrievable in ordinary daily activities.

Danby et. al.'s (2013) finding of ethnomethodology's ability to identify knowledge and skills as observable and retrievable in ordinary daily activities is what I am banking on in employing this as the framework of my study. In search of meaning in practice, I had to have a basis from which I would be able to make sense of the lived experience of the rice farmers' practice of agroenterprise. While I did not

recourse on the use of recorded video and focused on conversation analysis and in-depth interviews, the employment of ethnomethodology and its tenets made it possible for me to see agroenterprise from the eyes of the engaged rice farmers and understand how this affects their communicative practices.

Research Questions

In Chapter 1, I laid down the grounding of this study on the worldview of the rice farmers on agroenterprise and their communicative practices. In this part, I present the research questions that will be the backbone of this study. These questions will be the guide by which through ethnomethodology, knowledge of practice-based agroenterprise will be given premium.

Cronkite (1986, cited by Lindlof and Taylor, 2017) stated that the commitment of the communication discipline is to study human symbolic action in the various context of performance. Thus, in the performance of agroenterprise, empirical data derived from the transcribed conversation on the rice farmers' day-to-day lives, shed light on the following questions:

1. What is the view of the farmers on agroenterprise?
2. How does their view define their communicative practices as entrepreneurs?

These questions were aimed at exposing the rice farmers' view on agroenterprise through their conduct of such innovation, specifically their communicative practices. Their view is being sought to understand their adoption or non-adoption of

agroenterprise. Since this study looks into agroenterprise through the lens of communication, the communicative practices of the rice farmers provided information on human symbolic action by which espousal of agroenterprise can be determined among the rice farmers.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to provide knowledge on agroenterprise not as an innovation but as a practice of rice farmers. By providing viable empirical data on the conduct of agroenterprise by rice farmers, I hoped to help establish universal knowledge on the topic to facilitate its better understanding and appreciation. Endeavoring to have this universal knowledge, I sought to discover how the farmers make sense of their agroenterprise activities to provide a contextual explanation of this phenomenon.

The objective of this study supported the statement of Leeuwis (2004) who said that communication for innovation scientists and practitioners have long supported the idea that there was one 'right' direction in which farming should develop. Such an approach does not do justice to the existing diversity and runs the risk of failing to capture promising development opportunities. Since this is a practice-based study, knowledge was derived from rice farmers engaged in agroenterprise. It uncovered the organization and ingenuity of their enterprise. Their communicative practices also serve as cues as to the agroenterprise adoption or non-adoption by farmers who are not yet knowledgeable or engaged in such initiative.

Hence, the knowledge sought and offered of this study could offer a fresh perspective to agroenterprise-based project implementers on the factors affecting farmers' acceptance of the advanced farming activity they introduce. The universal knowledge also on agroenterprise provided by this study could help improve the delivery of extension services and serve as a guide in crafting the same projects.

Chapter 3

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, I assembled the related literature reviewed for the conduct of this study. The works presented here helped enhance my understanding of the subject, and how to approach the data that surfaced in the implementation of this research. I arranged the literature in the following order for the following reasons: Rice-based Agroenterprise in the Philippines – to set the scene of rice-based agroenterprise initiatives and to describe the extension modalities on the innovation; Farmers engagement in agroenterprise – a compilation of conducted studies on farmers' engagement on agroenterprise to determine what has already been known in the field; and Communication in the Enterprise/Agroenterprise Context – related studies on enterprise explored using communication to be used as a reference for analysis of the empirical data gathered through this study.

Rice-based Agroenterprise in the Philippines

The World Bank (2016) defines agroenterprise development as the process covering the entire gamut of activities concerning the supply of inputs, production, processing, transporting, and marketing of agricultural and related products. For the Catholic Relief Services (CRS), "agroenterprise refers to the business of organized farmers that actively work with market actors, having relationships with buyers of their products and business service providers that support the movement of their product in the market chain at a profit" (PhilRice document). These are operational

definitions from organizations that are often associated with the discussion on agroenterprise. While they present a clear description of what agroenterprise should be, this research puts premium into how farmers, who are the end-users of agroenterprise make sense of their practice.

With the current challenges faced by the agriculture sector, there is now a growing interest in advocating agroenterprise to increase incomes in the rural community. This arises from recognizing that big or institutional buyers only procure from traders who can reliably consolidate products in large quantities at competitive prices. Small farmers are unable to supply products in large volume and are limited to selling their products to agents who aggregate for big buyers. Hence, farmers often accept low prices offered by traders for lack of options. They were not able to share from the value addition that occurs as the product moves along the market chain toward the consumer due to passive involvement in the marketing process (PhilRice document). The intention of promoting agroenterprise represents a noble task of empowering smallholder farmers through collective production and marketing to become stronger players in the market. However, since the current approaches in agroenterprise-based projects focus on implementing the agroenterprise cycle, I believe there is a need to establish empirical data on the farmers' view on agroenterprise to counterbalance the technical information presented to them.

Now that I have presented the existing definitions or views on agroenterprise based on project implementers, I will be discussing why this study focused on rice. The crying need to make Philippine farms efficient and competitive as global competition intensifies into the next Philippine agriculture over the years, century and

millennium, and ensuring that such efficiency and competitiveness translates to the broadest benefits for the Filipino population (Habito and Briones, 2005). This proves to be true with the lifting of quantitative restriction (QR) for rice that resulted in the influx of imported rice that is cheaper than the locally produced ones. And since rice – being the Filipino's staple food – is sold cheaper (imported), consumers and traders benefit from the scheme but resulting in the downfall of the local rice farmers. Hence, the effects of market liberalization and globalization fueled by innovations in finance, communications, and transport are having weighty effects on how business is being conducted within the agricultural and food sectors. For farmers in developing countries, the level of liberalization has been profound and nowadays, farmers are not only competing with their neighbors but with farmers from neighboring countries and further afield (CRS). Introducing agroenterprise to rice farmers in the Philippines is one of the strategies to help them cope with the changing rice industry landscape. The succeeding paragraphs present how this is being implemented.

The Philippine Rice Research Institute (PhilRice) through its Rice Business Innovation Systems (RiceBIS) program carries out rice-based agroenterprise endeavors in the country. The RiceBIS is participatory action research. Participatory action research (PAR) is a type of research where a certain group of people from the marginalized sectors of the society gathers together and focus on analyzing information about their life and environment, which are eventually used in identifying the sequence of action they would implement to respond to their needs and problems (PhilRice documents). Thus, the RiceBIS envisioned an enhanced capacity of farmers to become profitable in rice production, committed to building a strong organization with a clear agro enterprise development plan, actively engage in

market opportunities, and will become a certified farmer agripreneur ("*Magsasaka na, negosyante pa!*").

The RiceBIS adopted community-based participatory action research (CPAR). Participatory action research (PAR) is a type of research where a certain group of people from the marginalized sectors of the society gathers together and focus on analyzing information about their life and environment, which are eventually used in identifying the sequence of action they would implement to respond to their needs and problems (Cabiles, 1994; Center for Community Engagement, 2015; and Community Tool Box, 2016 cited in PhilRice documents). Through the CPAR approach, farmers were facilitated to become farmer-entrepreneurs. It is also interesting to note that PhilRice is not alone in implementing such an approach. This trend is steadily increasing in the agriculture sector mainly due to the premium given by the current Department of Agriculture administration to agroenterprise.

In Midsayap, Cotabato where this study is situated, the RiceBIS is carried out by PhilRice Midsayap, one of the branch stations of PhilRice. The initial implementation of the RiceBIS resulted to select rice farmers' adoption of the agroenterprise cycle. However, the goal of rallying and organizing the rice farmers into a cooperative was not fully realized and only a few maintained their practice of agroenterprise (they are the farmer participants of this research). Aside from the RiceBIS, another agroenterprise-based project implemented by PhilRice Midsayap is the Cotabato Special Rice project. It used the same agroenterprise cycle provided by the CRS, but its focus is on the upland special rice variety. The implementation of both RiceBIS and Cotabato Special Rice indicates the persistence of implementing

agencies in promoting agroenterprise. However, with the groundworks already laid and initial results are starting to be seen, I deemed it was necessary to see agroenterprise from the rice farmers' perspective.

Farmers' engagement in agroenterprise

As mentioned in the previous sections, agroenterprise has been defined by various implementing agencies based on the results of research activities. While this research seeks to know and understand its (agroenterprise) meaning from the farmers' practice, since not all knowledge is limited to the scientific community (Saludadez, 2020 personal communication), other researchers also offer other perspectives which will be discussed in this section. This is supported by Stuiver, et. al., (2003) who suggests that it is starting to become widely recognized that farmers' knowledge has an important role to play in bringing about sustainable innovations in agriculture (Röling and Jiggins 1998; Chambers 1989; Hobart 1993). Empirical data on agroenterprise or entrepreneurship could still be augmented. While most literature on the said subjects are available, they focus on the operational or procedural aspect rather than the meanings accorded by the actors. the following paragraphs are just some of the related studies I found and considered to gain a better understanding of what has been discovered on farmers' engagement in agroenterprise.

A study by Charles Hennon in 2012 looked into entrepreneurship, farming, and identity. He conducted a phenomenological inquiry on the adoption of agribusiness by two farming families with their distinct agricultural traditions. He found out that though differing in tradition, the two families share similar choices for

survival in their agricultural business. They also share the same qualities when it comes to supporting systems in their business. He concluded that "entrepreneurial vivacity" is important for families or people who would like to venture into an enterprise. The finding of Hennon on the similarities in the practice of entrepreneurship of two farming families can also be observed in the local setting. In the bigger context of business, we can observe that it is typical for a business-oriented family to continue on the legacy. This means that engaging in business has been embedded in the family, some acquaint it with religion. However, I believe that engaging in business is not something genetic but it is a socially acquired skill, which could also be learned, and the transfer of such skill is facilitated by communication. Entrepreneurial vivacity is something that is developed over time through the ups and downs of the business, and the key takeaways or learnings from these scenarios are handed down in the family through conversations, dialogues, and mundane tasks which constitutes entrepreneurial communication practices.

Another study conducted by Joshua Jason Ringer in 2014 is on individual strategies for rebuilding food production ability in resource-poor post-conflict farming communities in Myanmar. His study documented the experience of the farmers who were affected by armed conflict. Farmers affected by the conflict were introduced to farming enterprises to help them cope with the effects of the conflict. His study revealed that policymakers and agricultural advisory services need to modify their strategies to match the needs of the farmers. Moreover, he concluded that farmers should be empowered by guiding them to participate in agricultural development. Ringer's study banked on agricultural advisory services' and policymakers' role in agricultural development about farm enterprises. Putting this result in the context of

this study, I think it adds to the reason why empirical data on agroenterprise on the farmers' worldview should be established to be able to serve as a reference for agricultural advisory services and policymakers. If the aim is to stimulate the role of agricultural advisory services and policymakers for rural development, there should be a basis for decisions and propositions. While the study of Ringer provided documentation of the lives of the farmers, the worldview on the needed intervention should be highlighted to guide agricultural advisory services and policymakers on the suited modalities for development that are needed.

Hennon and Ringer's studies employed the phenomenological approach which made use of lived experiences to arrive at the meanings given by the farmers. Hennon's study implies that agricultural business may be viewed as a family affair when practiced by a household. It further infers that tradition does not hinder survival choices to help the agribusiness flourish. Ringer's study, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of policymakers and agricultural advisory services in the empowerment of farmers. Both studies were able to give meaning or sense to the lived experiences of farming families and farmers. However, what sets them apart from this study is the absence of the communicative practices employed in the conduct or practice of the enterprise. Hence, this study wants to discover such communicative practices as experienced and practiced by rice farmers.

Communication in the Enterprise/Agroenterprise Context

In Chapter 1, the relevance of communication in agroenterprise was highlighted in understanding the worldview of the practice and performance of

agroenterprise. As agroenterprise actors using communication as a tool in the accomplishment of such practice, much can be learned from the farmers on how they view and communicate agroenterprise. This section will present related studies to shed more light on the importance of investigating agroenterprise from a communication perspective.

As farmers are not isolated individuals and are part of multiple social networks, which allows them to communicate (Leeuwis, 2004), they create a social system in their practice of agroenterprise. Hence, this social system is established and maintained by a social order which this study sought to discover. Below are discussions of related studies. These are presented to form the grounding of the present study.

The study conducted by Egon Noe and Hugo Fjelsted Alroe in 2004 on Farm Enterprises as Self-Organizing Systems aimed to establish a comprehensive model of farm enterprises as self-organizing social-technical-biological-economic systems. They underscored the need to establish a framework capable of explaining the organizational closure of a farm and the relational openness of the farming processes. That is since most frameworks in understanding models of farm enterprises center on activities as a key element of the system. They proposed to merge two schools of thought to come up with a plausible theory: The Actor-Network theory (ANT) of Latour, Callon, and Law, and Luhmann's Theory of Social System. The Actor-Network theory approaches a farm by translating and enrolling its elements thus presenting the relational openness of a farm enterprise. On the other hand, Luhmann's Theory of Social System denotes a social system as not consisting

of actors, but of communication, hence providing the operational closure of a farm enterprise.

Agroenterprise as a farm enterprise could also be explored through the two schools of thought presented by Noe and Alroe (2004). However, the ANT leans more on the cyclical view on agroenterprise since it concerns the enrollment of elements for relational openness. This means that what it mainly considers are the resources available in the farm to accomplish or satisfy the requirements of the conduct of agroenterprise. Using the ANT, anyone could account for the needed actors and resources for the operations of an agroenterprise. But when determining the worldview on the subject, the meaning that may arise will still be cycle-laden. Thus, in line with the interest of this study to explore rice farmers' agroenterprise communicative practices, I focused on Luhmann's Theory of Social System for this literature review. Although as mentioned, the ANT may also be explored in the same context, it is limited however to providing a theoretical analysis of the relativity of the actors and resources in the farmers' agroenterprise bubble. While the Theory of Social System which highlights communication as the main driver of a social system allows for a deeper understanding of the empirical data which this study used and analyzed. Moreover, since the theory was used to define the operational closure of a farm enterprise, it could give insight into how the farmers delimit their entrepreneurial activities through agroenterprise communicative practices.

Noe and Alroe (2004) explained that while the ANT implies the need to have a heterogeneous openness of relations between the entities of the social, biological, and technical domains of the world, Luhmann takes the opposite position in his

theory of social systems where he focuses on the operational closure necessary for any system to operate itself – and thereby he claims that all autopoietic systems are self-referential (Luhmann 1995 as cited by Noe and Alroe, 2004). By autopoietic, he signifies that a farm enterprise could continually recreate and maintain itself, based on its self as self-referential. And these were made possible through communication. Noe and Alroe further presented that Luhmann distinguishes between three kinds of autopoietic systems: biological systems operating in life, psychic systems operating in thoughts, and social systems operating in communication. Both psychic and social systems operate in meaning. In merging the ANT and Luhmann's Theory of Social System, Noe and Alroe presented that: the farm enterprise as a system has to select a meaning to be operational at all; otherwise, it will drown in internal complexity and will not be able to perform any kind of operation. This means that more than identifying the actors of the farm enterprise, the meaning or the view on these actors is equally important to define the operation that should take place to allow the continued operation of the farm as an autopoietic and self-referential entity.

Communication in agroenterprise allows it to be autopoietic. This denotes that once established, it could continually operate benchmarking from its previous operations as self-referential. As a social system, agroenterprise needs communication to define its operations. Hence, the meaning or worldview of the farmers on agroenterprise that this study seeks to know also dictates how they (agroenterprise ventures of the rice farmers) operate.

The agroenterprise communicative practices of the rice farmers could provide meaning to the actors of their enterprise. Putting communication as the driving force

of their social system, they can define their practices and create their worldview of an enterprise as an innovation. Communication in this context is not merely the transfer of messages but more on the self-referential communication processes of a management system (Noe, 1999 as cited by Noe and Alroe, 2004). This means that communication is applied in introspection as the farmers continually learn and make sense of their agroenterprise communicative practices. This also enabled the rice farmers to select their schema of differences, defend their logic, values, and meaningfulness (Noe and Alroe, 2004). Hence, helping them establish and maintain their venture.

Another study on enterprise viewed from a communication perspective is by Joep Cornelissen and Jean Clarke in 2012 on Sensegiving in entrepreneurial contexts: The use of metaphors in speech and gesture to gain and sustain support for novel business ventures. They emphasized sense giving as a tool for a meaningful discourse on the venture. Highlighting the need for effective communication in pioneering or new enterprise ventures, they used ethnography to demonstrate how two individuals creating new enterprise ventures give sense to others in real-time that involve not just their speech but also their gestures.

Cornelissen and Clarke (2012) found out that the sense giving of individuals, particularly in the early stages of the creation and commercialization of ventures, helps define what a venture means and why investment in the venture by others is both sensible and appropriate. Thus, sensemaking is crucial in determining the succeeding communication pathways in a venture. They further explained that both of their interviewees used metaphors in their speech and gestures that activate

domains of knowledge related to their embodied experiences (that is, human motor actions in the sense of bodily movements, the bodily manipulation of physical objects, and the felt experience of bodily engagement with objects). The use of metaphors allows for a more relatable discussion in which the audience or listener may better understand the context of the conversation. It also displays the experiential basis on the part of the speaker. Another finding of their study is that metaphors may help directly address the high levels of uncertainty and low levels of legitimacy surrounding the commercialization of newly launched ventures. Since metaphors allow for the framing of messages in an experiential setting, speakers are enabled to fortify their legitimacy. And finally, metaphorical scenes in sense giving in an entrepreneurial context lies in the fact that, in the absence of an institutionalized frame of reference (Aldrich and Fiol, 1994, cited by Cornelissen and Clarke, 2012), they may achieve comprehension and taken-for-grantedness (cognitive legitimacy) for a novel venture. The study emphasizes that being a new venture, communication using metaphors and gestures to both employees and prospective investors is crucial and considered lucrative. However, through sense giving, a fresh perspective is given in examining the way a new entrepreneurial venture is communicated. The authors also presented that metaphors may also help in gaining social acceptance of a new venture as they naturalize the new situation by drawing upon source domains that are already well understood and taken-for-granted (Davis et al., 1994; Douglas, 1986; Suchman, 1995 cited by Cornelissen and Clarke, 2012). This implies the ability of communication as an agenda-setter in terms of normalizing a new venture through metaphorical sense giving.

The study of Cornelissen and Clarke highlights the role of communication in enterprise development specifically on the establishment of a new venture. While there may be different levels and types of communication strategies employed in the varying levels of enterprise development, the perspective of sense giving in the previously discussed study supports the critical role of communication in an enterprise. Putting this perspective in the present study of exploring the agroenterprise communicative practices of rice farmers, there is a need to foremost know their worldview of agroenterprise to gain better insights on their choice of communicative practices. While the former study focused on face-to-face communication, and the present relies on empirical data, both bank on sense-making and giving as anchors of communicative practices which drive enterprises.

The third study in this section on communication in the enterprise is by Datis Khajeheian in 2018 on Enterprise Social Media: Ethnographic Research on Communication in Entrepreneurial Teams. His study focused on communication among members of an entrepreneurial team using social media as a platform. This study offers another vantage point in examining enterprise from the communication perspective. He aimed to develop a theoretical framework on how entrepreneurial team members communicate using a social media platform. Using the interpretative approach, he conducted observations by being a participant in the team, and in-depth interviews.

His analysis of data suggests a function that has been ignored in previous researches which plays an important role in the communication among team members as social media enable users to present an image of their lifestyle,

personality, and attraction into Livingroom as a market of messages. This suggests that each team members' background contributes to how they communicate with each other on social media.

Khajeheian proposes the Livingroom metaphor which suggests that enterprise social media provide a space for interaction of internal-external people similar to what home members and guests do in a living room (public conversations), as well as the possibility of conversation corners (private conversations). He suggested that organizations must consider these social media as a means for managing internal communications of members to make the workspace more pleasant and effective for their environment. Compared to the two preceding studies, Khajeheian's work focused on internal communication in the enterprise context. His work offers insight into how inside communication may be improved in various settings.

While the rice farmers of the current study are not yet tech-savvy as to adopt the suggestions of Khajeheian, his findings on entrepreneurial actors as presenting images of their lifestyle, personality, and attraction into livingroom is a context that may be considered in the farmers' social system of agroenterprise. It can be considered that farmers who will constitute an agroenterprise bring with them their own set of ideals which will ultimately affect their agroenterprise communicative practice since it may form the basis of how they make sense of what they are confronting. However, since the present study used empirical data, the ideals are already embedded in the farmers' accounts.

The three studies presented offer different approaches in examining enterprise from a communication perspective. Their findings imply that communication plays a crucial part in the development and maintenance of an enterprise. Whether internal or external communication, both stirs the social system created in the establishment of enterprise ventures. It is also important to note that sense-making and giving, which allows for the accordance of meaning to the various entrepreneurial factors, form the basis of the communication pathway, thus it is through communication that meanings are discovered and understood. The result of this present study hopes to contribute to the body of knowledge on agroenterprise from a communication perspective.

The last study I included for this section is by Rendra Kurniawan, Aji Dedi Mulawarman, Ari Kamayanti in 2014 on Biological assets valuation reconstruction: A critical study of IAS 41 on agricultural accounting in Indonesian farmers. While their study examined enterprise from an accounting perspective rather than communication, I found their findings relevant in the data analysis of this study.

Employing ethnomethodology, the authors studied how Indonesian farmers practice accounting in their farms in contrast with formal accounting taught in schools and practiced by professionals. Findings showed that the farmers are triggered by culture and social customs in the community, and the interactions that are based on kinship in the farming society in the management of their entities or enterprises. In terms of accounting, they employ traditional accounting or listing. They also noted subsistence farming where farmers are both producers and consumers of their products. In terms of valuation, the researchers found out that farmers' valuation

method is to measure or to accord value asset as an accumulation of utilities instead of measuring asset from a monetary aspect. The researchers concluded that as the result of their empirical study, agriculture in Indonesia has its way in the valuating biological asset. Farmers do not always use money as a valuation indicator of the biological asset or performance indicator.

Exploring rice farmers' engagement in agroenterprise through communication

In the preceding sections, I presented related literature on rice-based agroenterprise, farmers' engagement on agroenterprise, and exploring agroenterprise or enterprise through communication. These were presented to form the foundation of this study. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, and as presented in this Chapter, empirical data on farmers' engagement in agroenterprise could still be augmented. Using these related works of literature, I was able to better understand and analyze the data from the rice farmer participants of this study. Specifically, the findings of the studies of Noe and Alroe (2004); Cornelissen and Clarke (2012); Khajeheian (2018); and Kurniawan et. al. (2014) have been related to the results of this study. While differing in context, these works of literature were very much useful in making sense of the data from the rice farmers. Particularly, I was able to delve deeper into the rice farmers' agroenterprise communicative practices using the findings of the foregoing studies. For the main theme, I employed Luhmann's Theory of Social System as discussed by Noe and Alroe (2004) in their study as putting communication at the heart of a farm enterprise. The theory supported the empirical data from the rice farmers and validated the use of agroenterprise communicative practice as the operational closeness of their farm enterprise. Aside from Luhmann's

Theory of Social System, the findings of Hennon (2012) and Ringer (2014) were also compared to the main theme of the study. For the sub-themes, the analysis was supported by the conclusions of Cornelissen and Clarke (2012) on sense giving and metaphors; Khajeheian (2018) on livingroom context on enterprise communication; and Kurniawan et. al. (2014) on social and cultural triggers on farmers' entrepreneurial practices, and their farm record-keeping and management. While the findings of the mentioned studies were of great help in the analysis of the data collected, the main difference of this study from them is its framework of using communication as a lens to explore the worldview of the farmers on agroenterprise. Even though the former studies also used the communicative lens, they did not necessarily draw out the worldview of their research participants on their subject from the data. The other studies also did not put more premium on the communicative practices of the farmers, which sets apart this study. With the completion of this study, I hope that it could contribute to the pool of empirical data on agroenterprise or enterprise engagement of farmers and provide a communication-based breakdown of the meaning they accord to the subject. The in-depth discussions of the analysis of the data from this study and the findings of the previous ones are presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4

METHODOLOGY

Choosing the qualitative methodology was premised foremost on Tsourvakas (1997) who suggests that it brings us close to the performances and practice of communication. This notion is important since this study sought to identify the agroenterprise communicative practices of the rice farmers to further know their worldview of such endeavor. Qualitative communication research involves the performances and practice of human communication. By performances, we mean expressive communication where immediacy and skill transcend the status of messages as a transparent vehicle of transformation (Baumann, 1986 cited by Lindolf and Taylor, 2017). Since I was searching for communicative practices not limited to spoken or written words, employing the qualitative design suited the purpose. This is because more than what was said and recorded, the study demanded the meaning accorded behind the act or performance of agroenterprise. As such, communication in qualitative research is apprehended as the process of interpretation or meaning-making (Saludadez, 2020, electronic mail).

While Ethnomethodology was already thoroughly discussed in the preceding chapter, I will include here this concise perceptive as to the employment of such a method. Among the four traditions of qualitative research, Ethnomethodology was chosen for this study to know how farmers create a social order in their enterprise engagement. Within the ethnomethodological version of social order, accounts (i.e., how interactants go about "constantly describing and explaining to each other what

they have done") might best be construed as mini-ethnographies: in and through "tellings," understandings of events and their features are communicated (Beach, 1982). This ability of ethnomethodology allowed me to understand how farmers make sense of agroenterprise based on their practice and how their view affects the way they communicate such novelty.

Ethnomethodological tenets in the study of communication and agroenterprise

Putting ethnomethodology at work in exploring the worldview on agroenterprise, I conversed with the rice farmers practicing rice-based agroenterprise. The interview method was used based on the assumption that societal processes and social actions can be understood from the vantage point of the voices of the individuals living those experiences (Cole, 2005). Through the recorded and analyzed conversations and dialogues, the social order created by the farmers through their daily tasks, interaction, and communication surfaced. The social order presented by the farmers aptly conforms to ethnomethodology's view as explained by Trace (2015) as self-generating, contingent, and interpretative. Further, the framework used in the study facilitated the investigation of agroenterprise as produced by people's reasoning and interpretation. Ethnomethodology allowed for the investigation on the farmers' worldview on agroenterprise to be conducted close to where the practice is being done. This provided an endogenous perspective of agroenterprise from the rice farmers which enabled the researcher to discover their "lived world" through employing a granular approach to the phenomena (Chalmers, D. M., & Shaw, E., 2017). As actors of their social world, the rice farmers provided the

details of attention and mutually oriented methods of work, and order properties of mutual action, rather than abstract formulations (Rawls, 2008 as cited by Chalmers, D. M., & Shaw, E., 2017).

The analysis reflected the farmers' view on agroenterprise, and their agroenterprise communicative practices through ethnomethodological concepts in sense-making based on Trace (2015) which included: Indexicality, Reflexivity, Stock Knowledge, Documentary method of interpretation, and Accountability. I subscribed to Trace's ethnomethodological concepts in sense-making since he (citing Coulun, 1995) highlighted that ethnomethodology views social life as being constituted through spoken and written language. He further cited that ethnomethodology sees the social world as managed, maintained, and acted upon through the medium of ordinary description (Heritage, 1996). In the context of this study, this ordinary description of the rice farmers' agroenterprise practice was captured through the in-depth interviews conducted which were later on processed from being spoken word to written language through transcription. Hence, I am confident that through ethnomethodology I was able to capture the worldview of the rice farmers on agroenterprise and understand their communicative practices thereof. The following sections present Trace's ethnomethodological concepts in sense-making which I followed in making sense out of the empirical data collected through this study together with other related literature:

In the context of this study, Indexicality pertains to the farmers' understanding of their common knowledge on agroenterprise, Tsourvakas (1997) further explained that expressions that draw upon particular aspects of the local context to establish

orderliness, naturalness, and factuality are called indexical expressions. Indexicality involves the artful organization of behavior and other resources of a setting (like the workplace) to create a meaningful act. This means that farmers may accord expressions or communication practices that correspond to specific instances and categorizes them as "templates" on which they base their responses to situations. Thus, meanings that serve as a basis for these indexed expressions will allow a deeper understanding of actions taken. As Garfinkel (1967, cited by Tsourvakas, G., 1997) points out, indexical expressions possess rational properties because they are responsible for creating the order in interaction. The rules and norms of social situations are evident in the indexicality of the communicative action itself. Therefore, understanding this indexed expression of the rice farmers, knowledge is gained on how they naturally construct their reality.

On the other hand, Reflexivity applies to what they do or how they act based on their understanding. According to Watson (2005), Reflexivity in the ethnomethodological mode is conceived in terms of the inextricability of ordinary descriptions (such as typifications of persons, actions, or situations) from the circumstances they describe: in natural descriptive accounts, the description and the circumstances are reciprocally-elaborative. Reflexivity is linked with indexicality in such a way that it provides the standards by which expressions are indexed. This means that the rice farmers constitute indexed expression on agroenterprise and do something about it or act on it. They accord meaning in their expressions specifically about agroenterprise.

Stock knowledge indulges to the idea that the farmers have all kinds of background knowledge which ultimately affects their interaction and are even being handed down to generations. Schutz (1962, cited by Trace in 2015) further explained that stock knowledge is viewed in ethnomethodology as social in origin – coming from a person's own experience but more typically being derived from and interacting with others. As stated in Chapter 1, farmers are not isolated individuals. They are part of multiple social networks, and in that context are likely to communicate, directly or indirectly with a variety of actors (Leeuwis, 2004). Hence, they could keep and maintain stock knowledge through interaction.

The Documentary method of interpretation relates to the farmers' crafting of the meaning of action for every situation based on interaction. Compared to reflexivity, the documentary method of interpretation employs the use of patterns to build up a picture to infer meaning and motive in the behavior of others. According to Trace (2015), this explanation of the documentary method of interpretation is drawn from the work of social theorist Karl Mannheim. This tenet suggests that the rice farmers may treat actions as documents and presupposes an underlying pattern from their common knowledge. This means that the rice farmers may make use of past experiences as points of comparison or benchmark to their current situation on which they could anchor their actions.

Finally, Accountability is on the rice farmers' disposition and coherence together with that of other farmers. Eriksen (2002) explains accountability citing Garfinkel as observable and reportable, i.e. available to members as situated practices of looking and telling. These practices Garfinkel (as cited by Eriksen, 2002)

sees as "an endless, on-going, contingent accomplishment". Eriksen (2002) further explicates that Garfinkel's "accountability" is identical to, and depends on the skill with, knowledge of, and entitlement to the detailed work of accomplishing, the activities by which people produce, and manage settings of organized everyday affairs. Central to these accounting practices and accounts is their reflexive character, i.e. that in the constantly ongoing accomplishment of them we embody our lives and constitute ourselves as subjects. In their conduct of agroenterprise activities, the rice farmers become accountable for keeping their venture in order. This accountability of keeping their new social order can be accomplished by the rice farmers in two ways: having the stock knowledge as being accountable for their actions, and being visible producers of actions.

In this study, these ethnomethodological tenets served as the parameters by which I ferret through the data and surfaced the themes and sub-themes corresponding to the research questions. The discussion on the analysis of the data about these tenets is presented in Chapter 5.

The Researcher as the Research Instrument

According to Tsourvakas (1997), the research "instrument" is the human investigator, who reflexively becomes an inseparable part of both the action itself and the ensuing description. Zagado (2013) stated that one pertinent quality that a researcher must possess in conducting interpretative research is his knowledge of and familiarity with the phenomenon under study. As the research instrument of this study, I indulged myself in conversations with rice farmers to know their stories, their

mundane activities, and their experiences of doing rice-based agroenterprise. My dialogues with them could be described as carefree, collaborative, and casual. Aside from their experiences in doing business, our conversation topics ranged from farming to their youth, their secular experiences before farming, education, their families, and even their hopes and plans. In our talks, having this background information helped me a lot in processing the empirical data from their agroenterprise practice, that I was able to code their statements and follow through their train of thought to form the themes for this study. The study conducted by Olszewski, et. al. (2006), identified three primary themes on the coding work in an ethnomethodological investigation: creating agreement, maintaining the integrity of the codes, and completing the work. I likewise encountered these three qualities of coding work in this study, leading to the generation of the themes. More of this will be discussed in the succeeding sections.

Participants and Site Access

In Chapter 2, I presented the establishment and implementation of various rice-based agroenterprise. In brief, agroenterprise is seen as a way to make rice farmers more competitive by ushering them into the market instead of relying on middlemen. The extension works in this initiative are mostly guided by the agroenterprise framework which has been developed by the CRS and tested in other countries and in other commodities aside from rice. Since the gist of this study is to provide empirical data on the subject, the main consideration of choosing the participants is their depth of engagement in the new venture.

What I refer to as depth of engagement in agroenterprise is the sustenance of the rice farmers on their venture. Thus, the three participants of this study were chosen for the following considerations: (1) all of them were introduced to agroenterprise at the same time; (2) all do not have any background or experience in agroenterprise before the introduction; and (3) they established their agroenterprise venture after the introduction and were able to sustain it. These factors helped in choosing the participants of this study whom I believe would be able to give substantive empirical data to answer the research questions. As Tsourvakas (1997) puts it, they are the "human subject", whom we respect and from whom we learn. Hence, their accounts serve as the meat of this study.

I was able to gain access to the research site through the assistance of the RiceBIS team who introduced the farmers to the concept of agroenterprise. Based on their monitoring, I was able to identify the three farmer participants and engaged in series of in-depth interviews with them and even got to know their family members and familiarized their rice fields. I would like to note here also that the conduct of this study was during the COVID-19 pandemic. The restricted interaction during that time disrupted the interview schedule, which was not possible through any other means than face-to-face interaction due to the farmers' limited network access.

Data Collection and analysis

For the data collection and analysis, I subscribed to Brysiewicz (2012) who gathered that despite differing philosophical underpinnings or theoretical frameworks that guide overarching analysis processes, there are a few basic steps that are

shared in most methods. These are (1) recruiting persons to the study who can answer the research question -this was already discussed in the preceding section; (2) recording interviews with these persons -my conversations with the rice farmers were all recorded and stored; (3) transcribing the interview to text -all conversations were transcribed; and (4) analyzing the text -this will be discussed in the succeeding paragraph.

For the text analysis, I indulged in the process of reading, re-reading, and "immersing" oneself in the text. As I was reading and re-reading the transcriptions, I keenly observed patterns of similarity and differences that connect different elements in the data, such as passages. During the analysis process, I swung back and forth between the texts, the analytical framework, and previous research to build new insights on the topic. After immersing myself in the data, I coded sections of text and then combined codes into categories/themes. I developed a matrix that facilitated my coding and analysis of the texts. Headings of the matrix included: what the text is telling me about agroenterprise, and how does it relate to the other texts. Through the matrix, I was able to narrow down texts and came up with the theme and sub-themes corresponding to the research questions. I share the same experience in ethnomethodological coding and analysis with Olszewski, et. al. (2006), who identified: creating agreement, maintaining the integrity of the codes, and completing the work as the main themes of theme-making in Ethnomethodology. In the case of this study, an agreement was seen in the similarities of texts which were coded together to form sub-themes. The integrity of the codes was maintained by ensuring that the generated codes and themes surfaced from the transcriptions and follow the flow of the conversations. By following through the natural flow of the conversations,

the theme and sub-themes generated reflected the relevant points of the transcript on the knowledge sought by this study.

Chapter 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study aimed to answer two research questions: (1) What is the view of the farmers on agroenterprise; and (2) How does their view define their communicative practices as entrepreneurs.

Farmers' View: Agroenterprise is an advanced farming activity.

The main theme that I was able to surface in the analysis of the farmers' experience of doing agroenterprise is: Agroenterprise is an advanced farming activity. This view of the rice farmers on agroenterprise can be interpreted using Luhmann's Theory of Social System as used by Noe and Alroe (2004) in their study, as it suggests that a farm enterprise as an entity does not rely on actors but on communication to define its operational closeness. I define operational closeness in this context as the boundaries by which the rice farmers delimit their practice of agroenterprise or recognize their conduct thereof. Hence, as the rice farmers define their practice of agroenterprise, their communicative practices serve as the markers by which they recognize that they are indeed "agroenterprising". To come up with this main theme, I also made use of the tenets of ethnomethodology which include reflexivity, indexicality, documentary method of interpretation, and accountability. I will make mention of the applicable tenet for each agroenterprise communicative practice, but the full discussion will be presented in a separate section following the presentation of the themes.

The following excerpts from the rice farmers' narratives helped me surfaced the main theme:

"Salig ka sa basakan, na basakan lang hindi ka mag inter crop o palayamanan wala ka sang maabot labi pa ng wala ka san, libot ka lang ng libot amo na makasiling sila na lisod ang farmer pero kung sa akun mam di man lisod ang farmer kung may another ka na income" (If you solely depend on your rice farm without inter-cropping, it will be difficult. But if you know how, there are a lot of opportunities in the farm.) [F2 lines 585-587]

"Oo tapos, makita sang uban, dili sila parehas sa amon na nakaseminar, pero makita man gud sa uban, "gwapo lagi ng pantay pantay, wala sang halo" "didto mangaboy ko didto" (Others can see the difference of our crop stand compared to those who did not undergo training. They can observe the uniformity and purity in our rice field, so they decide to buy seeds from us.) [F3 lines 139-140]

"Pero ako mam sa pagfarm, kay wala ko gid ginahuna huna na madiscourage, malisod na madiscourage ka maglisod ka mistress ka, amo gani siling ko sa una sang huli tao pako dako tampok tungod lagi kay damo akun trabaho, akon kay imo sugo imo trabaho, ti mistress ako gamay pero siling ko sige lang kay responsibilidad man gid naton ni tagaan nato sang pagtagad ang atong mga bata, salamat man pud gani ko na duha akun bata para nga hindi nila ko masisi ba kay unsahay man gud mam magawas man pud abi gid na akun ginakanan na pobre, pero gitary gid nako na makaya ko,

siling ko sa mga anak ko, "biskan wala ko kwarta nak, tuman lang gid kamo sa akun, kay hindi ko na gagustohan na hindi kamo makatapos kay ang gusto ko makatapos kamo kay proud ko na tatay nyo na makahuman kamo" (I try my best not to get discouraged with farming because it will stress me out. I always think of my responsibility of taking care and providing for my children, and I am thankful that my children are very considerate. So, I keep telling them to believe in me, because I want them to finish their studies. I am the proudest when they finish their schooling.) [F2 lines 283-292]

The excerpts show how farmers developed and enriched their rice farming practices | acumen, skill, and attitude which led them to establish and sustain their agroenterprise ventures. In the excerpts, the rice farmers give off the sense of agroenterprising as they discuss opportunities on the farm, uniformity in crop stand, and their proud moments as parents. All these correspond to their agroenterprise communicative practices which will be discussed in the succeeding sections.

In the literature, I compiled on agroenterprise, most findings center on policy changes and advisory services (Ringer, 2014), and making agribusiness a family affair (Hennon, 2012). While I also found traces of the same findings in the data of this study, they are rather case-to-case in nature or isolated in some sense. The major finding of this study that is Agroenterprise is an advanced farming activity that proves to be a practical and grassroots-level insight that makes a lot more sense when explored through the rice farmers' communicative practices.

Agroenterprise seen as an advanced farming activity means that to be able to do it entails preliminaries as presented in the sub-themes: (1) Financial preparedness and acumen developed; (2) Farming practices enhanced; and (3) Filial obligations accomplished. Going back to Luhmann's Theory of Social System, these delimit or are the indicators set by the rice farmers on their practice of agroenterprise. This farmers' view on agroenterprise is based on their first-hand experience of practicing such innovation. The shift from mundane farming to agroenterprise allowed the farmers to identify the latter as a more progressive endeavor requiring the mentioned preliminaries which also serve as their communicative practice in transmitting information and ideas on their new craft which are discussed in the next paragraphs.

Agroenterprise Communicative Practice 1: Financial preparedness and acumen developed

In my analysis of the rice farmers' narratives, the first communicative practice that surfaced is on how the farmers developed financial preparedness and acumen. This is evident in their saving attitude, farm diversification, and practical entrepreneurial skills. Their practice of financial preparedness and acumen gives other farmers the idea of how they were able to venture into agroenterprise. Aside from talking about their self-initiated financial rules, the values of discipline and consistency also affirm their communicative practice. This could be linked in the study of Cornelissen and Clarke (2012) on the sense giving of individuals, particularly in the early stages of the creation and commercialization of ventures that help define what a venture means and why investment in the venture by others is

both sensible and appropriate. This means that saving, farm diversification, and entrepreneurial skills are metaphors in the sense that they are used in speech and gestures that activate domains of knowledge related to their embodied experiences.

As I conversed with the rice farmers, and as I immersed myself in the data from our conversations, I discovered the depth of their understanding of agroenterprise based on their financial preparedness and acumen. As to how these could be communicated with others through practice, I went back to Cornelissen and Clarke's (2012) study that suggests that metaphorical scenes in sense giving in an entrepreneurial context lies in the fact that, in the absence of an institutionalized frame of reference (Aldrich and Fiol, 1994, cited by Cornelissen and Clarke, 2012), they may achieve comprehension and taken-for-grantedness (cognitive legitimacy) for a novel venture. As agroenterprise is a novel venture for other rice farmers, metaphorical scenes provided by the rice farmer participants of this study can fill in for the lack of information and exposure. Simply put, other rice farmers can easily relate to the participants' agroenterprise communicative practice because they can communicate it with relatability.

The use of metaphorical expressions and scenarios makes this agroenterprise communicative practice indexical. As a tenet of ethnomethodology, indexicality involves the artful organization of behavior and other resources of a setting (like the workplace) to create a meaningful act. This means that farmers may accord expressions or communication practices that correspond to specific instances and categorizes them as "templates" on which they base their responses to situations. Thus, meanings that serve as a basis for these indexed expressions will

allow a deeper understanding of actions taken. Putting money in the bank, diversifying crops, and scenarios that the rice farmers recall when they were able to use practical entrepreneurial skills can be indexed as agroenterprise communicative practices. They are the templates by which the rice farmers symbolically communicate their agroenterprise communicative practice.

Financial preparedness and acumen developed are symbolic of the rice farmers' use of metaphors in expressing their accomplishment of such agroenterprise activity. For savings and farm diversification, word symbolism is prevalent in the narratives, while metaphorical scenes work for practical skills. This symbolism allows for the communication of this particular requirement in agroenterprise. Since the rice farmers' agroenterprise endeavors are an ongoing accomplishment, the symbolism through metaphors allows them to present their sense-making abilities which may promote universal knowledge to audiences who will also make sense of their experience, and gain knowledge on agroenterprise. This phenomenon is fundamental in what this study is trying to achieve – the meaning behind the rice farmers' action and to facilitate the generation of knowledge for universal application and a better understanding of agroenterprise.

Moving on, financial preparedness and acumen as an agroenterprise communicative practice are presented in terms of savings, farm diversification, and practical entrepreneurial skills.

The following paragraphs will provide the excerpts for each:

Subtheme 1.a. Saving is essential.

Agroenterprise-engaged farmers emphasized the need for savings as part of financial preparedness. Statements on banking like "*Ibangko mo eh, isipon dayon ang bangko*" (Put it in the bank, always think about the bank) [F1, line 562]; "*Oo, gabangko ko*" (Yes, I [save thru] banking) [F3, line 639]; and "*Amo gid ng bangko gid na*" (That's why I put it in the bank) [F1, line 564] are repeated throughout their narrative.

Aside from saving through banks, the notion of "extra money" can also be observed in the narrative in statements such as: "*Pero abi nimo tood mam ang uban magsiling na ang pag uma lisod pero sa akun siling ko daw hindi man lisod, basta may extra money kalang*" (They say farming is difficult, but it is not as long as you have extra money.) [F1, line 1007]; "*Una una gid kay dapat may extra money ka kay budlay mangumay kung wala kay extra money*" (In farming, you have to have extra money.) [F2, line 192]; and "*May basakan sila didto magharvest ko tapos nakaipon ko na, may prenda prende; oo, didto ko nakasugod mam*" (I go after the spilled paddy after harvest and save it. I sell it to have extra money and still save it.) [F3, line 721].

In these excerpts from the farmers' narratives, banking and having extra money emerged as metaphors by which they communicate savings as essential. This means that when communicating their agroenterprise practices, the farmers need not directly mention saving but put it into a more practical context. This allows for clearer sensemaking as the farmers can draw from their experiences

metaphorical scenes by which they practice their agroenterprise. These metaphorical scenes provide better grounding on the novel idea of agroenterprise when it is communicated to other farmers and non-practitioners, as in my case as a non-practitioner of agroenterprise, I was able to understand farmers conduct of their enterprise and communicative practices thereof through their use of these metaphors.

On the meaning that savings are essential, the rice farmers stated that:

“May ara man gamay savings. Makabalay lang man gihapon” (I was able to save a little. I was also able to build a simple house.) [F1 line 196]

“Ibangko mo eh, isipon dayon ang bangko.” (You should put the money in the bank. Always think about the bank first.) [F1, line 562]

“Lisod kay, maano ng maayo lawas mo primi, amo gid ng bangko gid na.” (It is not certain that you will not be sick, so it's better to have some money in the bank.) [F1, line 564]

“Oo, gabangko ko, usahay may mga promo, pagtapos harvest magpalit ko daan.” (I save thru banks. I also avail of promos. After harvest, I immediately buy inputs.) [F3, line 639]

“Ang uban kay wala man capital; ang uban man abi kay di kabalo kung dako gani kay sagi gasto gasto ti pagusto baklon wala na gatipid tingala na

amo na ila.” (Others do not have money for capital, because if they have money they keep on spending it. They do not know how to save.) [F1lines 530; 535-536]

“Una una man gid sa farming mam, una una gid kay dapat may extra money ka kay budlay mangumay kung wala kay extra money ngano man, parehas sa akun ako mismo ang gahandle sa trade cash kung wala ka extra money kaya mo ba yan? Pero simple lang man ang pag farming kung may extra money ka.” (In farming, you have to have extra money. Farming becomes simple if you have extra money.) [F2, lines 192-195]

“Pero abi nimo tood mam ang uban magsiling na ang pag uma lisod pero sa akun siling ko daw hindi man lisod, basta may extra money kalang kay siling ko sa una gani, kaya ko gani sa una na wala sang ayuda samantala karun may ga ayuda na, kay kaisa wala man ko gainspect ka taramnan ginabayaran na sa akun bata, siling pang sige pangita ka tulo ka tao paispray magpahagbas ka tambak ng wala tanum kay ginapalimpyohan ko pero kung may tanum ako gid mismo.” (They say farming is difficult, but it is not as long as you have extra money. I just hire some extra help for the maintenance of the farm.) [F2, lines 1007-1012]

“Pero sa una mam, basi sa akun experience, wala ako sang basakan ang asawa ko gatrabaho pero hindi kayo, ako kay my anak ibilin ko na sa akon igsoon, may basakan sila didto magharvest ko tapos nakaipon ko na, may prenda prende; oo, didto ko nakasugod mam, isa ka kahon hantod nagdamo,

tapos rights ang akon napalit, may sarili naman ako na yuta mam." (I

experienced leaving my children in the care of my siblings to work on the farm. I go after the spilled paddy after harvest and save it. I sell it to have extra money and still save it. Because of that, I was able to buy rights of land until such time I had my farm lot.) [F3, lines 720-722, 726-727]

Aside from metaphors of banking and having extra money they used in communicating their saving attitude with their practice of agroenterprise, the rice farmers were also able to stress its essence. In the excerpts I included above, they identified a variety of reasons in which savings is deemed essential in the practice of agroenterprise. Entrepreneurial reasons such as availing of promos, hiring of additional farm works, to health and personal safety are among the things the farmers highlighted as main reasons why savings is essential in their practice of agroenterprise.

Subtheme 1.b. Farm diversification for multiple sources of income.

Farm diversification as part of financial preparedness and acumen was presented by the farmers in accounts such as "*mag inter crop o palayamanan*" (practicing inter-cropping or palayamanan) [F2, line 585]; "*basta may diskarte*" (being innovative or resourceful) [F2, line 316]; and "*kay ako gagarden man ako dira*" (I maintain my own [vegetable] garden) [F3, line 387]. These are also the metaphorical statements by which they can communicate their agroenterprise practice to others. In my conversations with the rice farmers, being a non-farmer, these helped in the

appreciation of their wisdom in rice farming which led to better grasping how they were able to establish and maintain their agroenterprise endeavors.

The farmers have these to say about farm diversification for additional income:

"Oo lisod, ti kung amo na sya, ang himuon sang farmer maggarden sya kami, kay ako gagarden man ako dira, oo, pang inadlaw adlaw lang gud." (It is really difficult but all the farmer has to is to also plant and maintain his garden. I have my garden and it helps in my daily needs.) [F3, lines 382 - 383, 387]

"Kay sa una kay magmahal ang marko ti dako ang kita. Ti dako may savings gud na dako kay hindi ng saligan mo kay farm lang. May hayop ka, may baboy. May gamay gamay na income ta aside sa humayan ko kay may honorarium man ko sa barangay. Libre pa gid ang duwa bata mo sa College sa may USM." (If the prices are high, we also have big income and savings. Aside from the farm, we also have livestock. My other source of income before was my honorarium as a barangay officer. On top of these, two of my children were able to avail themselves of free tuition from a local state university.) [F1 lines 204-207]

"Oo mam, pero gaano, idea gid kung unsa akun part time, karun gaano ka ako gatanom ka balatong every cropping makaincome man ko 18 000- 30 000 dako dako, kay almost 1 000 ka puno every cropping." (I always think of other income sources in the farm. I earned Php 18,000 to 30,000 from planting string beans.) [F2 lines 267-269]

"Ang palay okay rin pero gumagawa kami ng paraan para magkaroon ng additional income. Hindi lang sa pagtatanim ng palay; tanim ng vegetables and pag aalaga ng hayop." (Income from palay is good, but we make ways to have additional income. We do not only plant rice, but we also plant vegetables and raise livestock.) [F2, lines 1426, 1483, 1487]

"Gaan gaan lang man, basta may diskarte, nagababoy kami, may baka kami, so may garden so medyo hindi man masiling na lisod, lisod kung di mo paghimuon." (As long as you strategize, farming is bearable. We raise pigs and cows, and maintain a vegetable garden.) [F2, lines 316-317]

"Sa una tong gagmay pa tong akong mga bata, kay ang akun idea sa una, mahilig abi sang mangharvest sa una, harvest ko sa basakan ana, gatrabaho jud ko sa basakan, pero sa karun kung ako na farmer na ako gapangharvest dira na ako sa bahay, syempre ang natutukan ko kay ang paggarden, atleast may pang inadlaw adlaw ako na pangkwaan." (When my children were still small, I worked in the rice field. Now that they are grown up, I can have more time for my garden. Aside from rice, the garden adds income for daily expenses.) [F3, lines 391-394]

"Oo ginsave ko, nagbaboy ko, hindi ko magsalig sa akun farm, nagaharvest ako, tapos syempre naan a syay usik, makaipon kog 3 kasako, di ko na ibaligya, ipunon ko na sya, pero syempre kung may istudyante kaw, ibaligyan na nimo dayon, kung makabaligya ko ibakal ko na sya ka feeds kay

ipakaon ko sa akun baboy, sa pagbaligya didto syempre wala utang, didto ko nakasave.” (I save money. I raised pigs, I did not rely solely on our farm. During harvest, I go after the spilled palay and save them. But if you have students, you will be compelled to sell them. When I do sell though, I also buy feeds for my pigs. And since I can sell something, I slowly was able to stay out of debt.)
[F3 lines 713-716]

Subtheme 1.c. Practical entrepreneurial knowledge and skills are used.

In my analysis of the rice farmers' narrative, the use of practical entrepreneurial knowledge and skills surfaced in the case of the following farmers' expressions:

“Good seeds lang, hindi na ako ang siling na sila lang man ang nagatext, siling ko okay meron, ingon sila pwedi na makuha siling ko kay hulat lang mga 25 days to 30 days para walay feedback, so karun bulan nag harvest na ang Baliki.” (We sell good seeds. Interested buyers text us ahead of time for reservations. We advise them when they will be able to get their seeds to ensure germination. Now, our former customers are expecting a good harvest.)
[F2 lines 461-463]

“Wala man siling nalugi mam, kay kung isipon nimo tong nag agi ang humay kay 13 samantala ang gidipose namo kay 30 how much more, sobra ½.” (We gained more than half the price if we disposed of our harvest as fresh palay.) [F2, lines 512-513]

“Syempre, kasi mam ikaw na negosyante na mainit ang ulo medyo malayo ang tao, kasi ung tao pag alam nya na ganyan ugali mo hindi kaagad lalapit yan” (If you are engaged in business and you are hot-headed, people will shun you.) [F2 lines 1898-1899]

“Oo ang buyer ang gaduol; syempre mag istorya istorya lang kaw na naa ko didto seeds, chismis” (Buyers are the ones approaching us. They learn about us through referrals and sometimes, grapevine.) [F3 lines 761, 765]

“Oo eh, amo ang gikwan nya, kay hindi daw dapat na ang farmer na magpabilin lang sya na tigtanum, dapat ibaligya, pagkatanum nya pagkaharvest ibaligya diretso, tanum ulit, dapat ang farmer maging negosyante sa iyahang sarili na harvest sa iyang product.” (We were taught that farmers should not remain as planters, we have to be business-minded in our harvest and product.) [F3, lines 929-931]

“Syempre, sa once na magnegosyo ka himuan mo gid na sya sa simple lang na financial, puhon, gasto nimo, mga laborer nimo diba? Amo mana sya, kay kung wala ka experience magsiling ka magnegosyo ka diin ang basehan diin ang kwan, paano nimo mabal an ang imo gasto ang imo ginasya” (When you do business you need to have even a simple financial report to track your expenses. It will serve as the basis of your cost and income.) [F2 lines 706-709]

“Oo, kay gafarm kalang giapon, siling ko ning sa inputs adlaw adlaw ka dira ka gid hindi mo na pwede bayaan, basta kwarta na gani pag usapan kinanglan na ikaw gid ang gagunit kay unlike sa seeds na magtext lang sya na oh malakat ko dira karun, so matagaan mo gid sang panahon.” (Compared to selling farm inputs, I prefer selling seeds because it is still farming. I can even just text my customers.) [F2, lines 1158-1161]

Unlike savings and farm diversification which may be metaphorically communicated through the use of phrases and terms, practical entrepreneurial knowledge and skills were discussed to me by the rice farmers using scenes. This is due to its practical applicability in that they are used in various situations. While savings and farm diversification may be readily appreciated and applied as part of agroenterprise communicative practices, practical entrepreneurial knowledge and skills demand experience be gained. An example is when one of the rice farmers told me that her way of advertising is through the grapevine. With minute knowledge on the impact of word of mouth and face-to-face communication, the farmer through her experience applied the principle in her entrepreneurial activity. By talking about seeds, she casually mentions selling them thereby starting the flow of information.

Agroenterprise Communicative Practice 2: Farming practices enhanced

Another agroenterprise communicative practice that surfaced in my analysis of the rice farmers' claim of agroenterprise as an advanced farming activity is the enhancement of farmers' farming practices. It could be substantiated through improved record-keeping and the application of appropriate farming technologies.

After fortifying financial preparedness and acumen, applying advanced farming technologies enabled farmers to develop their resources. This finding could be linked to the study of Kurniawan et. al. (2014) who found out that farmers are triggered by culture and social customs in the community, and the interactions that are based on kinship in the farming society in the management of their entities or enterprises. In terms of accounting, they employ traditional accounting or listing. They also noted subsistence farming where farmers are both producers and consumers of their products. In my analysis of the rice farmers' account on this agroenterprise communicative practice, I note that this may be considered as the technical part of their practice as it relates to the conduct of record-keeping and application of appropriate farming technologies. However, similar to the findings of Kurniawan et. al. (2014), I realized that social and practical customs are the driving force as to why farmers employ such methods. The social influence could be deciphered in the rice farmers' benchmarking and comparison of their practices to other farmers and members of their immediate community. While practicality is seen in their simple yet effective, as they claim, ways of managing their farms.

The ethnomethodological tenet present in this communicative practice is the documentary method of analysis displayed by the rice farmers in the valuation of their rice fields. Since this particular communicative practice deals with the application of suitable crop management technologies in promoting productivity, the results of such performance provide the "document" by which the rice farmers can analyze the effect of practicing and non-practicing of the recommended technologies. As a tenet of ethnomethodology, the documentary method of analysis helped surface this communicative practice.

As a communicative practice, enhanced farming practices of the agroenterprise-engaged rice farmers symbolize technical knowledge and skills in crop production. Since agroenterprise is viewed as an advanced farming activity, the rice farmers are communicating the need for knowing and applying appropriate technologies and doing record-keeping to cope with agroenterprising. Their performances of these practices should send a strong message to other farmers who do not follow suitable crop management technology. The rice farmers' kinship as explained in the previous paragraph facilitates the transmission of this notion to other farmers. The fact that the agroenterprise-engaged farmers can have better yield during harvest with less cost is in itself communicating their enhanced farming practices, thus warrants their agroenterprise initiatives.

The following sections present the excerpts corresponding to how the rice farmers practice enhanced farming practices as an agroenterprise communicative practice:

Subtheme 2.a. Record-keeping improved farm management.

Agroenterprise-practicing farmers underscore the importance of record-keeping as shown in the following quotes:

“Oo halin pagtabas ko na primero butang ko na gid.” (I list even my very first weeding activity.) [F1 line 505]

“Syempre, sa once na magnegosyo ka himuan mo gid na sya sa simple lang na financial, puhon, gasto nimo, mga laborer nimo diba? Amo mana sya, kay kung wala ka experience magsiling ka magnegosyo ka diin ang basehan diin ang kwan, paano nimo mabal an ang imo gasto ang imo ginasya.” (When you do business, you need to have even a simple financial report to track your expenses. It will serve as the basis of your cost and income.) [F2, lines 706-709]

“Ara gid ng sa sunod tuig pila income mo pila nagasto mo tanan, pati panimalay mo” (I also keep records of my yearly income, expenses, including household expenses.) [F1 line 918]

“Kay kung halimbawa hanggang salita ka lang, wala ka sang record imposible, atleast may ano ka biskan notebook na simple lang, may listahan ka.” (It would be difficult if you do not keep a record, even a simple notebook.) [F2, lines 721-722]

“Oo ang baboy ko man may capital na ang feeds lista ko gid na ginarecord kung may ginansya.” (Even in hog raising, I list down the feeds I buy so I will know how much is my capital.) [F1, lines 510-511]

“Oo eh, ginalista ko man gid na ang ginansya ko ginalista ko na. Kay ako man garecord diri, isa ka adlaw ko na record diri.” (I always list my income. I record it. I allot time for recording.) [F1, lines 897, 903]

"May organic man kami, kung ang farmer magrecord lang mas dako iya income kaysa mga de sweldo." (We also maintain an organic farm, if a farmer records his income and expenses, he'll know that he earns more than regular employees.) [F3, lines 591-592]

Similar to the findings of Kurniawan et. al. (2014), the rice farmers keep simple records of their finances in line with agroenterprise practice. They described their records as a simple listing of cash in and out for their finances, while they made use of the calendar for their production activities. While other factors in farming and agroenterprise may be attributed to socio-cultural factors, record-keeping is considered by the rice farmers as their edge. In our conversations, they emphasized that through record-keeping they become more aware of their savings and spending that they can make more sound decisions. This practicality enhanced their farming practices which allowed them to engage in advanced farming as such agroenterprise.

Subtheme 2.b. Appropriate farming technologies are applied.

The quotes I included below illustrate the farming practices of the farmers who applied appropriate farming technologies:

"Ti kay ang nabal an mo kay tudloan man ky naa may seminar." (They will teach what you need to learn in seminars.) [F1 line 266]

"Sa pag class namo primero kay practice sa humay halin sa seed preps seedings tanan amo sa tamang pagharvest kag sa pagbaligya na." (In our class, we were taught how to improve our farming practices from seed to seed.)
[F1 lines 271-272]

"Kita me nila, ang uban gani kay diri gakuha tingala gani ko na upod man me ngseminar, daw ambot kung naintindihan ba nila." (Others see what we are doing, some even avail of my seeds. It makes me wonder because we attended the same seminar.) [F1 lines 659-660]

"Pero tingala ko okay maayo man kami diri sa RiceBIS pag una ko sunod man sila tanan, usahay ako lang man ginabantyan diri samon, sa basakan ako ginabantayan nila amon. Amo mangkot sila san o ko mag sagwag hambalon ko amo ni na petsa magsunod lan man giapon sila." (Other RiceBIS farmers ask about my planting schedule and follow it.) [F1 lines 673-676]

"Ang farming abi hindi mo gid na sya mahambal na taas gid. May ara gid failure, pero sa pag-dala mana. Tanom ka sang semilya mo, mag-rouge ikaw. Kaagi man ko tanan sina sauna, survive man gihapon. Depende pud sa semilya. Pag-galam mo sa humayan, mabal-an mo mana. Sauna damo ko na-atenan nga farmers' class." (You cannot predict what will happen on your farm. I experienced its highs and lows, but I still survived. If you spend time on your farm, you understand it better. I also attended a lot of farmers' classes.) [F1 lines 137-140]

"Didto subong sa taramnan gani didto dapit damo hilamon ti amon diri daw okay man, sa pagdala pa tas taas taas didto sakop namon na RiceBIS lang man giapon pero daw wala giapon." (In our fields, you will see that non-RiceBIS farms are weedy.) [F1, lines 667-669]

"Ooo napahuman, ngaa man? kay nakita ang imong ebidensya pero wala, siling ko dapat bago ka mag ano magpagawas ka istorya paminaw usa, itry usa, para makita mo gid usahay man gud na sya mam sabay me magpaharvest, ang 13 000 nya sina nasa 90-100 ang akun kay nasa 140-150, magsiling sila na ano gid ang sekreto, amo gani ang siling ko ang sekreto ara sa aton, istoryahan nato diba, ang K na halin sa wala, amo na sya ang sekreto mangita sang maayo na binhi, land prep, pest management, water management amo ina ang sekreto, ang sekreto na tuwid." (I tell other people to try the technology before they say something about it. When we harvested the last time, I harvested 140-150 cavans compared to their 90-100. When they asked me how I did it, that's when I recalled to them the rice crop management technologies.) [F2, lines 642-648]

"Sa land prep ginacheck gid na tanan. Katatlo, pag abuno gid timing ka pag abuno dira." (I make sure that I follow the proper procedures in land preparation. Proper timing in fertilizer application is important.) [F1, lines 1406 and 1414]

"Kay ang kwan amo lang man na, syempre farmer ka imonitor mo gid na primi eh, kung kinanglan ba ang pesticides ang abuno." (It's quite simple.

Farmers should just monitor their rice fields if they need to apply pesticides and fertilizer.) [F3 lines 499-500]

“Oo tapos, makita sang uban, dili sila parehas sa amon na nakaseminar, pero makita man gud sa uban, “gwapo lagi ng pantay pantay, wala sang halo” “didto mangaboy ko didto.” (Others can see the difference of our crop stand compared to those who did not undergo training. They can observe the uniformity and purity in our rice field, so they decide to buy seeds from us.) [F3, lines 139-140]

In my analysis of the rice farmers' enhanced farming practices, I saw that they were able to identify theirs as enhanced or improved ways through result comparison with other rice farmers. As Kurniawan et. al. (2014) suggested, farmers are triggered by the interactions that are based on kinship in the farming society in the management of their entities or enterprises. Since rice paddies are situated close together with most only separated by bunds, visual comparison of crop management practices reveals enhanced farming.

Similarly, the kinship of the farmers with one another prompts dialogues on how others were able to enhance their crop production. Kinship plays a vital role in rice farming communities. As I conversed with the rice farmers, I observed that they can pinpoint the differences between their crop management practice with other farmers. Hence, together with record-keeping, their application of appropriate rice farming technologies are what they consider and communicate as enhanced farming practices.

Agroenterprise Communicative Practice 3: Filial Obligations accomplished

The third agroenterprise communicative practice I surfaced in the analysis is the rice farmers' accomplishment of their filial obligations. This finding may be considered as the most personal part of the results as it constitutes the rice farmers' backgrounds. Khajeheian (2018) found out that entrepreneurial actors present images of their lifestyle, personality, and attraction into livingroom context in his study of communication between entrepreneurial team members through social media. Though my interaction with the rice farmers is all one through face-to-face conversations, and the nature of communication is not lateral – that is farmer to farmer in line with Khajeheian's study of communication between entrepreneurial actors – the living room context in agroenterprise communication is also evident in our dialogues. Hence, the rice farmers were able to share their filial accomplishments as part of their agroenterprise communicative practice. This enriched my understanding of their worldview since they allowed me to have access in their personal lives thereby giving me a broader perspective to understanding why they engage in such innovation and why they display their meaning of agroenterprise in such a manner.

The rice farmers' agroenterprise communicative practice of accomplishment of filial obligations in my analysis is the easiest theme to surface because it was the most evident among the three accounts, and there was similarity and pattern. Hence, I could say that in brief, rice farmers feel they can engage in agroenterprise when they have already fulfilled their filial obligations. On the flip side, this may also mean that without accomplishing filial obligations, agroenterprise ventures may be

challenging, but both could arrive in the fact that rice farmers put their families, their children's education to be exact at the top of their priority list.

The ethnomethodological tenets of reflexivity and accountability helped me surface this agroenterprise communicative practice. Reflexivity which allows the farmers to make sense out of their experience is evident in their emphasis on fulfilling their filial obligations. On the other hand, their accountability in keeping it in order is also shown in the narrative as to how they would carry out or perform their tasks based on their agroenterprise agenda since they have already fulfilled their filial obligations.

Compared to enhanced farming practices, the symbolism for the accomplishment of filial obligations may be closer to financial preparedness and acumen. However, unlike the latter, filial obligations delve into how the farmers prioritize their finances concerning their agroenterprise venture. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph children's education is prioritized by rice farmers, while in terms of financial preparedness and acumen it metaphorically communicates how finances may be augmented and sustained through savings, crop diversification, and practical entrepreneurial skills. While other rice farmers may be able to perform developed financial preparedness and acumen, if they have multiple children to provide for, money-related constraints may still hinder their participation and interest in agroenterprise. Hence, being able to do agroenterprise may be symbolized by less or accomplished filial obligations.

The following excerpts from the narratives allowed for the surfacing of this agroenterprise communicative practice:

“Tapos sina ang bata na lima kabilog, tigastuhan man” (It is my responsibility to provide for my five children.) [F1 line 173]

“Kay kabalo ka wala pako kapatukod subong diri, kay ginauna ko gid ang future sang mga bata” (I was not able to build a decent house because I put my children’s future first.) [F2 lines 47-48]

“Pero ako mam mas malipay ko kung sila man mag decide, sabagay di man gid sila magmahay kay gipaiskwela ko man gid sila, so ginapdesisyon ko sila kung ano magskwela o mangnguma? Magskwela ko pang, ako kay manguma kay daw hindi ko makaya, kay ako ang rason ko kung saan kayo masaya suportahan ko kita.” (I allow my children to decide what they want to do. I will support whatever would make them happy.) [F2 lines 411-414]

“Sa una nang gagmay pa akun mga bata priority.” (Raising my children was my priority.) [F3, line 418]

“Ako mam, kay nalipay ko kay nakaprofessional ko akun mga anak, ngano man? Kay nakita ko akun sikap, may ebidensya ba, na ako isa ka farmer natagaan ko sang maayo nga future ang bata.” (I am happy that my children are all professionals because I can see the fruit of my perseverance. That as a farmer, I was able to give them a better future.) [F2, lines 205-207]

"Pero gina-siling ko man gid na sa ila mam, sila man ang gaano ang gadesisyon, wala man ko gasiling na ginasaywar ko lng man sila kung ano ang choice nila, kay makuha ko man gid na interesado kay biskan gatarangkaso kay di gid mag absent, ano absent nalang kay, hindi pang kay mabitin ako, so makita gid nakon na interesado, so pagkagraduate bago sya, malapit na maggraduate ginatagaan gid nako sya opportunities, ginacelebrate ko gid, ning babae ko pagkagraduate nya sa high school giletchonon ko pero siling ko anak, sa college ka biskan walang wala ako magproduce gid ako ka letchon kag isa ka baka ihawon ko gid basta iskwela, so amo na sya na daw." (I can see that my children are serious with their education because they go to school even when they are sick because they would not like to miss out. That is why I celebrate their achievements, I make it a point to revel their success.) [F2 lines 421-428]

"Sa uban lang, sa akun na opinyon lang ginauna ko gid ang future sang mga bata kay wala problema ang kwarta kung may trabaho na silang tanan ako syempre tigulang nako ang katapusan ko na lang na ginaplano is makapatindog balay." (I always put the children's future first. Money can always be found. I am already old. My last plan is to build a decent house.) [F2, lines 1529-1531]

"Lisod eh, naay traders kami na ginautangan, nga kung wala ka kwarta pangbayad tuition sa mga bata, maadto ka didto sa mga traders, pagharvest didto na tanan sa traders wala nay bilin." (It was really difficult. We loan money

from traders because we don't have money to pay for tuition fees of our children. So, all harvest also goes to the traders.) [F3, lines 356-357]

"Oo, nagka utang utang pa gani ko sa mga traders, mga tapos harvest may balance pa ako 20 000 pag kwan ko sa traders na nakabuhi na ako sa traders ng wala na ako balance tong wala na ako istudyante, sa una priority gid" (We relied on traders. Even after harvest, I still owed them around 20,000 pesos. I was only able to settle my balances when all my children finished school. They are my priority.) [F3 lines 422-424]

"Hindi gid enough, kay kung gaikwela ang mga bata dakoa ng expenses ang balon, mga pagkaon; oo, magka utang utang ka" (It is not enough because when you have students you have to provide for pocket money, food. You will resort to loans.) [F3, lines 675, 683]

The living room context as Khajeheian (2018) suggested enabled me to delve a little deeper into the lives of the rice farmers. Since our dialogues were interactive and casual, they were able to freely share their thoughts on their agroenterprise practices about their personal lives. For farmers, being able to support their children's education is their ultimate success. If agroenterprise demands certain investments, and in the context of this study is delimited by communicative practices, rice farmers chose to invest in their children foremost. Thus, the accomplishment of filial obligations is viewed as a requirement to engage in agroenterprise.

Situating the empirical results to the theoretical/analytical framework

Applying the ethnomethodological tenets in this study, I was able to uncover the social order established and maintained by rice farmers in their practice of agroenterprise. Since ethnomethodology focuses on seeing how a member constructed, accomplished, and maintained his or her social world (Trace, 2015), this study ruled out how they (rice farmers engaged in rice-based agroenterprise) through understanding their meaning in action, and their communicative practices.

Practicing agroenterprise, the rice farmers saw it as an advanced farming activity. Thus, their actions are all geared toward establishing financial preparedness and acumen; enhancing their farming practices, and accomplishing filial obligations to maintain their enterprise. Hence, their communicative practices allowed them to carry on this social order of advanced farming activity, since these are mutual, social, and shared. As Luhmann's Social Theory as cited by Noe and Alroe (2004) puts it, a farm enterprise is driven by communication, and in the context of this study, these agroenterprise communicative practices define the operational closeness of their practice of agroenterprise as the worldview of agroenterprise as an advanced farming activity is steadily premised in their communication practice. Through ethnomethodology, these orderly actions were identified that gave insight into the culture of knowledge and skills as observable and retrievable in the rice farmers' ordinary daily activities.

Agroenterprise worldview and communicative practices set in ethnomethodological tenets

To better understand the farmers' social order on agroenterprise through their communicative practices, ethnomethodology tenets of indexicality, reflexivity, documentary method of interpretation, and accountability were applied. In the following sections, I discuss how these tenets helped for better analysis and understanding of the empirical data of this study.

Since language use and action are indexical, farmers statements for financial preparedness such as "*Ibangko mo eh, isipon dayon ang bangko*" (Put it in the bank, always think about the bank) [F1, line 562]; "*Oo, gabangko ko*" (Yes, I [save thru banking]) [F3, line 639], denotes that there is a common understanding of the context that saving is essential in the practice of agroenterprise. The repetition of these statements and phrases puts forward how the rice farmers emphasize the need to save and subscribe to banks in the performance of agroenterprise tasks.

In terms of enhancing farming practices, farmers also share mutual understanding on the importance of record-keeping through statements like "*Kay kung halimbawa hanggang salita ka lang, wala ka sang record imposible, atleast may ano ka biskan notebook na simple lang, may listahan ka.*" (It would be difficult if you do not keep a record, even a simple notebook.) [F2, lines 721-722], and "*Oo ang baboy ko man may capital na ang feeds lista ko gid na ginarecord kung may ginansya.*" (Even in hog raising, I list down the feeds I buy so I will know how much is my capital.) [F1, lines 510-511]. These statements on record-keeping were not only

repeated but put in the context of their practice shows that this indexical behavior surfaced through their communication practices is important in their agroenterprise ventures, and facilitates tasks related thereof.

For the accomplishment of filial obligations, the prevalent repetition of statements regarding their children's future in accounts like the following: "*Sa una nang gagmay pa akun mga bata priority.*" (Raising my children was my priority.) [F3, line 418], "*Ako mam, kay nalipay ko kay nakaprofessional ko akun mga anak, ngano man? Kay nakita ko akun sikap, may ebidensya ba, na ako isa ka farmer natagaan ko sang maayo nga future ang bata.*" (I am happy that my children are all professionals because I can see the fruit of my perseverance. That as a farmer, I was able to give them a better future.) [F2, lines 205-207], and "*Sa uban lang, sa akun na opinyon lang ginauna ko gid ang future sang mga bata kay wala problema ang kwarta kung may trabaho na silang tanan ako syempre tigulang nako ang katapusan ko na lang na ginaplano is makapatindog balay.*" (I always put the children's future first. Money can always be found. I am already old. My last plan is to build a decent house.) [F2, lines 1529-1531] made the communicative practice indexical. In Chapter 5, I stated that the rice farmers put their children's education on top of their priority list. I also explained that this notion is communicated through their expressions of proud moments in the educational milestones of their children. Hence, it is very indexical that preparing for their children's education and accomplishing such filial obligation is an agroenterprise communicative practice. As a pre-requisite, the first one in fact, for the engagement in advanced farming the accomplishment of filial obligation is primarily indexed as one of the agroenterprise communicative practices of the rice farmers.

Reflexivity or the expression that farmers “make of” or “do something about their practice of agroenterprise can be observed in their accounts such as in the accomplishment of filial obligation where the rice farmers said *“Pero gina-siling ko man gid na sa ila mam, sila man ang gaano ang gadesisyon, wala man ko gasiling na ginasaywar ko lng man sila kung ano ang choice nila, kay makuha ko man gid na interesado kay biskan gatarangkaso kay di gid mag absent, ano absent nalang kay, hindi pang kay mabitin ako, so makita gid nakon na interesado, so pagkagraduate bago sya, malapit na maggraduate ginatagaan gid nako sya opportunities, ginacelebrate ko gid, ning babae ko pagkagraduate nya sa high school giletchon ko pero siling ko anak, sa college ka biskan walang wala ako magproduce gid ako ka letchon kag isa ka baka ihawon ko gid basta iskwela, so amo na sya na daw.”* (I can see that my children are serious with their education because they go to school even when they are sick because they would not like to miss out. That is why I celebrate their achievements, I make it a point to revel their success.) [F2 lines 421-428], and *“Sa uban lang, sa akun na opinyon lang ginauna ko gid ang future sang mga bata kay wala problema ang kwarta kung may trabaho na silang tanan ako syempre tigulang nako ang katapusan ko na lang na ginaplano is makapatindog balay.”* (I always put the children’s future first. Money can always be found. I am already old. My last plan is to build a decent house.) [F2, lines 1529-1531], and *“Lisod eh, naay traders kami na ginautangan, nga kung wala ka kwarta pangbayad tuition sa mga bata, maadto ka didto sa mga traders, pagharvest didto na tanan sa traders wala nay bilin.”* (It was really difficult. We loan money from traders because we don't have money to pay for tuition fees of our children. So, all harvest also goes to the traders.) [F3, lines 356-357]. These statements assert that the farmers do something about their understanding of agroenterprise since they have personal goals they wish to

fulfill. Their accomplishment of filial obligations requires them to be reflexive so they may engage in advanced farming activities.

Farmers' stock of knowledge is evident in their accounts such as: "*Sa land prep ginacheck gid na tanan. Katatlo, pag abuno gid timing ka pag abuno dira.*" (I make sure that I follow the proper procedures in land preparation. Proper timing in fertilizer application is important.) [F1, lines 1406 and 1414]; "*Oo tapos, makita sang uban, dili sila parehas sa amon na nakaseminar, pero makita man gud sa uban, "gwapo lagi ng pantay pantay, wala sang halo" "didto mangaboy ko didto."*" (Others can see the difference of our crop stand compared to those who did not undergo training. They can observe the uniformity and purity in our rice field, so they decide to buy seeds from us.) [F3, lines 139-140]; "*Kita me nila, ang uban gani kay diri gakuha tingala gani ko na upod man me nagseminar, daw ambot kung naintindihan ba nila.*" (Others see what we are doing, some even avail of my seeds. It makes me wonder because we attended the same seminar.) [F1 lines 659-660]; "*Pero tingala ko okay maayo man kami diri sa RiceBIS pag una ko sunod man sila tanan, usahay ako lang man ginabantyan diri samon, sa basakan ako ginabantayan nila amon. Amo mangkot sila san o ko mag sagwag hambalon ko amo ni na petsa magsunod lan man giapon sila.*" (Other RiceBIS farmers ask about my planting schedule and follow it.) [F1 lines 673-676]; and "*Ang farming abi hindi mo gid na sya mahambal na taas gid. May ara gid failure, pero sa pag-dala mana. Tanom ka sang semilya mo, mag-rouge ikaw. Kaagi man ko tanan sina sauna, survive man gihapon. Dependepud sa semilya. Pag-galam mo sa humayan, mabal-an mo mana. Sauna damo ko na-atenan nga farmers' class.*" (You cannot predict what will happen on your farm. I experienced its highs and lows, but I still survived. If you spend time in your farm,

you understand it better. I also attended a lot of farmers' classes.) [F1 lines 137-140].

These statements present farmers' appreciation and application of the technical knowledge they acquired through learning and interaction with other farmers.

Though in the case of the agroenterprise-engaged farmers, their interaction with other farmers does not necessarily add to their knowledge but proves that it is their edge. These statements also highlight how the stock of knowledge can be handed down or transferred such in the case of the rice farmers, their application, and display of enhanced rice farming practices. With this stock of knowledge also, the rice farmers can make use of documentary methods of interpretation that are making a document out of a scenario and identify patterns for better response. In the case presented above the rice farmer can make a comparison of his rice field compared to the other farmers, thus he is making a document out of the difference to decipher a pattern and from there he could identify his practices that are effective compared to the other farmer.

Lastly, the rice farmers' accountability in the observance of their agroenterprise social order is evident in their accounts like "*Pero sa una mam, basi sa akun experience, wala ako sang basakan ang asawa ko gatrabaho pero hindi kayo, ako kay my anak ibilin ko na sa akon igsoon, may basakan sila didto magharvest ko tapos nakaipon ko na, may prenda prenda; oo, didto ko nakasugod mam, isa ka kahon hantod nagdamo, tapos rights ang akon napalit, may sarili naman ako na yuta mam.*" (I experienced leaving my children in the care of my siblings to work on the farm. I go after the spilled paddy after harvest and save it. I sell it to have extra money and still save it. Because of that, I was able to buy rights of land until such time I had my farm lot.) [F3, lines 720-722, 726-727], and "Ooo

napahuman, ngaa man?, kay nakita ang imong ebidensya pero wala, siling ko dapat bago ka mag ano magpagawas ka istorya paminaw usa, itry usa, para makita mo gid usahay man gud na sya mam sabay me magpaharvest, ang 13 000 nya sina nasa 90-100 ang akun kay nasa 140-150, magsiling sila na ano gid ang sekreto, amo gani ang siling ko ang sekreto ara sa aton, istoryahan nato diba, ang K na halin sa wala, amo na sya ang sekreto mangita sang maayo na binhi, land prep, pest management, water management amo ina ang sekreto, ang sekreto na tuwid." (I tell other people to try the technology before they say something about it. When we harvested the last time, I harvested 140-150 cavans compared to their 90-100. When they asked me how I did it, that's when I recalled to them the rice crop management technologies.) [F2, lines 642-648]. These accounts show that farmers could provide rational and observable evidence to their claims-making them accountable. Thus, since they have such accountability, they can maintain and accomplish the social order in agroenterprising. With their stock knowledge on agroenterprise, they become responsible or accountable for their actions, and as they perform their entrepreneurial activities and exercise their agroenterprise communicative practices, they become accountable to being producers of action.

These findings of the rice farmers' social action in practicing agroenterprise revealed through ethnomethodology add to its unique contribution to the social sciences (Chalmers and Shaw, 2017). Being able to shed light on the social order created and maintained by the rice farmers through their agroenterprise communicative practices offered a lot of learnings to me, and future researchers of the topic on better understanding the worldview of farmers. The inter-relatedness of the themes based on naturally occurring situations in farmers' mundane activities,

provide how the basis on how they make sense of their lived world thus prompting the action, that is agroenterprise. Moreover, applying the tenets of ethnomethodology allowed me to delve deeper into the lived world of agroenterprise by rice farmers.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The main purpose of this study was to explore agroenterprise through the lived experiences of rice farmers. Using qualitative methodology with Ethnomethodology as the research framework, I analyzed empirical data from rice-based agroenterprise engaged farmers to answer the following research questions: What is the view of the farmers on agroenterprise, and How does their view define their communicative practices as entrepreneurs. I found out that rice farmers view agroenterprise as an advanced farming activity. As an advanced farming activity, their communicative practices as entrepreneurs are shaped by factors that allow them to engage in such advanced farming practices. Hence, they should have financial preparedness and acumen; their farming practices enhanced, and their filial obligations accomplished. Based on the experience and practice of the rice farmers of their rice-based agroenterprise, these communicative practices allow for the establishment and maintenance of an agroenterprise.

Examining deeper into their narratives, their communicative practices can be further defined into their saving attitude, farm diversification, practical entrepreneurial skills, record-keeping, and application of appropriate rice farming technologies. In my conversations with the rice farmers, these communicative practices were not explicitly identified as communicative practices, rather these are their mundane tasks

that ultimately contribute to their practice of agroenterprise. Hence, in my immersion in the data, I surfaced these themes using ethnomethodology to analyze the empirical data. I used the ethnomethodological tenets of indexicality, reflexivity, documentary method of interpretation and accountability in ferreting for the themes and sub-themes in response to the research questions. After identifying the salient themes and sub-themes of the study, I also made use of the related literature discussed in the previous chapters to better understand the data provide my explanation of the worldview and communicative practices of the rice farmers on agroenterprise.

In line with Luhmann's Social Theory as used by Noe and Alroe (2004) in their study, communication serves as the center of a farm enterprise as an autopoietic system that is self-referential. The rice farmers' agroenterprise practices can be identified as autopoietic as it could continually recreate and maintain itself through communication. The findings of this study – the rice farmers' agroenterprise communicative practices – allow them to establish and maintain their enterprise venture. Based on their worldview that agroenterprise is an advanced farming activity, the rice farmers sustain their entrepreneurial activities as reflected in their agroenterprise communicative practices.

Findings of other related studies that I used in analyzing the texts included Cornelissen and Clarke's (2012) study that suggests that metaphorical scenes in sense giving in an entrepreneurial context lies in the fact that, in the absence of an institutionalized frame of reference (Aldrich and Fiol, 1994, cited by Cornelissen and Clarke, 2012). The rice farmers' first agroenterprise communicative practice of

financial preparedness and acumen developed could be broken down further into the following sub-themes: savings, farm diversification, and practical entrepreneurial skills. In my analysis, these symbolized how the farmers embody their financial preparedness and acumen. Further, for each of the sub-themes, the rice farmers also made use of metaphors to communicate their entrepreneurial practice. In the case of savings, the rice farmers used terms such as banking and having extra money; and for farm diversification, they pitch in terms such as "*diskarte*" (strategy) and inter-cropping or gardening. While for practical entrepreneurial skills, their metaphors tend to be more situational to emphasize realism or depending on the need to be addressed. Metaphorical communication in the context of agroenterprise communicative practices allowed the farmers to showcase their agroenterprise practice through communication.

I also subscribed to the study of Kurniawan et. al. (2014) to examine the rice farmers' agroenterprise communicative practice of farming practices enhanced. In their study, I learned that farmers are triggered by their kinship and society and that they employ simple record-keeping. In my conversations with the rice farmers, I discovered that they consider their record-keeping practices as their advantage compared to other farmers. They described their practice as simple listing which evolved from calendar inputting in their early practice. In the context of their agroenterprise practice, they said that record-keeping allowed them to monitor their cash flow and better understand opportunities and risks for decision making. In terms of the application of appropriate farming technologies, the rice farmers display this agroenterprise communicative practice with kinship as their springboard. In my conversations with them, they often emphasize the differences in crop management

practices between them and other farmers. This insight is allowed through their close affinity with other rice farmers resulting in familiarity in their mundane activities. Since they see that their crop management practice result in better productivity, thereby allowing them to engage in advanced farming activity – agroenterprise – they continue their practice of applying appropriate farming technologies. And in instances when other farmers ask for advice from them on crop management, they are not merely transmitting tacit knowledge on crop production but also practicing their agroenterprise communicative practice of farming practices enhanced.

The third study I considered in my analysis is Khajeheian's (2018) livingroom context in his study of communication among entrepreneurs. His study emphasized that entrepreneurs communicate using or bringing their backgrounds and personality. In my conversations and interaction with the rice farmers, this living room context came to play as they were able to share with me personal details of their lives as we were discussing agroenterprise. While our communication cannot be considered as entrepreneur to entrepreneur as in the case of Khajeheian's (2018), the livingroom context allowed my deeper inspection of the rice farmers' meaning in their practice of agroenterprise. In my analysis, it surfaced that rice farmers put their children's education foremost. Hence, practicing agroenterprise congruent to the accomplishment of filial obligations may be challenging. Although they still undertake some mundane filial tasks and obligations, they maintain that these are unlike the bulk and burden of sending their children to school. Thus, I give to the thought that the typical rice farmer could only engage in agroenterprise after finishing off the educational requirements of their children, and as such their third agroenterprise communicative practice of filial obligations accomplished.

Conclusion

With the foregoing findings, I believe that this study achieved its aim of providing empirical data on the rice farmers' practice of agroenterprise. Supported by findings of previous studies, the results of this study can contribute to widening the body of knowledge in agroenterprise as a fast-emerging agricultural development intervention, specifically in rice farming.

Although this study does not offer a generalized view on agroenterprise, it served its purpose of establishing empirical data on the conduct and practice of the subject. Hence, it could contribute to the improvement of extension modalities using agroenterprise platform in the research site and adjacent areas. I hope that it will give project implementers fresh perspectives in implementing, creating, and reviewing agroenterprise-based projects. The findings of this study could also be a reference for policy recommendations as it reflects practice-based information. Ultimately, I am optimistic that this research was able to be a conduit by which the rice farmers' voices were heard and noticed.

Banking on the framework and results of this study, and according to Stuver, et. al., (2003) it is starting to become widely recognized that farmers' knowledge has an important role to play in bringing about sustainable innovations in agriculture (Röling and Jiggins 1998; Chambers 1989; Hobart 1993). As mentioned in the previous chapters, farmers have the skills and acumen that are needed to make research, development, and extension initiatives have more impact.

This study adds to the pool of farmers' knowledge in presenting their worldview on agroenterprise. By defining their worldview on agroenterprise and their communicative practices, this study hopes to give useful insights into the implementation of agroenterprise-based programs and projects. Likewise, the practice-based data generated by this study can provide useful insights to be considered in the crafting, planning, and evaluation of agricultural interventions. As this study puts forward how rice farmers schematize their agroenterprise practice, localized or farmer-based strategies on agroenterprise may be developed which be more suited for rice farmers for a more inclusive and holistic impact.

Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, I came up with the following recommendations. These are divided into two categories: Practical and Methodological. Since the participants and site of this study were part of agroenterprise-based project implementation, the findings of this study may be readily applied to ongoing implementations (practical). On the other hand, the context in which I use the term methodological in this section pertains to the crafting and planning of agroenterprise-based projects or future studies related to agroenterprise.

Practical Applications

On-going agroenterprise-based projects may benefit from the findings of this study through the following practical approaches: mind-setting and preparedness

coaching on agroenterprise, tailored than mantle approach may be employed, and farmer-to-farmer engagements may be enhanced.

Mind-setting and Preparedness Coaching on Agroenterprise

With the worldview given as an advanced farming activity, agroenterprise should be introduced in such a way that farmers will understand what they should expect in accepting such innovation. From my conversations with the rice farmers who are already engaged in rice-based agroenterprise, their communicative practices imply that since agroenterprise is an advanced farming activity, any taker should be ready to step up their farming performances. And this notion goes beyond production, but also character, and all the needed resources. Hence, project implementers should go back to mind-setting or integrate it in their activities so the farmers may assess their preparedness to accept such innovation.

Highlighting in this recommendation is the finding on fulfillment of filial obligation as an agroenterprise communicative practice. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, farmers may not be able to engage in agroenterprise even if they have savings, crop diversification, and enhanced farming practices, if they feel that they need to set aside these resources for the fulfillment of their filial obligations. For an average farmer, who solely relies on farming, the education or other basic needs of the family come first. Hence, risking resources on agroenterprise may pose a challenge to them. Hence, I recommend improved mind-setting activities and preparedness coaching.

Tailored than mantle approach

Once determined who among the farmers are ready to take on agroenterprise, there should be a separate program of activities for each. While those who are ready to take on agroenterprise activity may proceed with the set activities, those who are not yet confident to proceed should be given pre-agroenterprise interventions. This could span from production acumen and skills, financial literacy, and other developmental mediations. It is important to remember that agroenterprise and farming as a basic way of life are heavily reliant on society. Thus, if there are location-specific technologies aimed at increasing farm productivity, there should also a social counterpart to address concerns on common dilemmas.

In line with the results of this study, farmers may be assessed through the agroenterprise communicative practices: financial preparedness and acumen, farming practices enhanced, and filial obligations accomplished. These may be developed into categories wherein farmers may be grouped or classified to do more specific and suitable intervention may be prepared for them.

Enhanced farmer-to-farmer engagements

Farmer to farmer approaches remains as one of the main modes of technology transfer in agriculture. It is seen as a more practical and sustainable way of disseminating farming ideas in the community. However, it could still be enhanced by putting it on a more individual level. Since agroenterprise engagement is viewed

by the farmers as an enhanced farming activity, it requires more than the adoption of regular farming technologies. It also entails decision-making which has an impact on the farmer's personal life. Thus, these farmer-to-farmer engagements should be promoted and enhanced. Knowledge sharing and learning activities may help in enhancing farmer relationships especially in family settings where agricultural communicative practices are effectively and efficiently applied.

Methodological Recommendations

For the planning and crafting of agroenterprise-based projects or conduct of future studies on the topic, the following may be helpful:

Use of qualitative research

In support of the foregoing recommendations, the use of qualitative research should be more embedded in the conduct of agroenterprise-based initiatives. The current practice involves the qualitative framework in the baseline and verification stages. While this aids in the research implementation and complements the mixed-methods used, employing the qualitative approach at the conception and initial implementation of the intervention may provide more precise and needed data. While it does not offer a general worldview, it enables researchers to pinpoint specific areas which may need specialized interventions leading to a more effective and efficient technology transfer.

For consideration for further studies, since this study focused on knowing the worldview of the farmers on agroenterprise and their agricultural communicative practices which may help other farmers engage in the same endeavor, another study may be conducted to know their basis or reasons for adoption and non-adoption of agroenterprise.

Another study on pre-agroenterprise or agroenterprise preparatory activities or interventions may also be explored. This will help in enhancing the adoption of agroenterprise for those deemed not yet fit to engage in such advanced farming activity.

Review of previous agroenterprise-based intervention implementation

Aside from magnifying the role of qualitative research in agroenterprise-based interventions, it will also help review the conduct of previous or similar endeavors which may produce viable data for the current conduct. While the realities captured in conversations and dialogue may change over time, it provides a reference and benchmark that will help researchers in crafting more engaging and result-delivering interventions.

Another study may also be conducted on the transfer of agroenterprise practice using the agroenterprise communicative practices herein, and other factors which may eventually be put into light.

References

- Baticados, G. N. (2018). Best Practices of Agri-entrepreneurs in the Philippines. Available online at <http://ap.fftc.agnet.org/index.php>
- Brysiewicz P. & Erlingsson C. (2012). Orientation among multiple truths: An introduction to qualitative research, *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2012.04.005>
- Butler, Carly & Fitzgerald, Richard & Gardner, Rod. (2011). Branching out: Ethnomethodological approaches to communication. Catholic Relief Services. 2009. Working Together, Learning Together. United States of America.
- Catholic Relief Services. (2009). Getting to Market From Agriculture to Agroenterprise. United States of America. ISBN 0-945356-50-1.
- Chalmers, D. M., & Shaw, E. (2017). The endogenous construction of entrepreneurial contexts: A practice-based perspective. *International Small Business Journal*, 35(1), 19–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242615589768>
- Chauhan, J. (2007). Communication in Agriculture. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Cole, C. L. (2005). Paul Ten Have (2004). Understanding Qualitative Research and Ethnomethodology [35 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(3), Art.12, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0503121>.
- Cornelissen, J. P., Clarke, J. S., & Cienki, A. (2012). Sensegiving in entrepreneurial contexts: The use of metaphors in speech and gesture to gain and sustain support for novel business ventures. *International Small Business Journal*, 30(3), 213–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242610364427>
- Danby, S., Davidson, C., Theobald, M., Scriven, B., Cobb-Moore, C., Houen, S., Grant, S., Given, L.M., & Thorpe, K. (2013). Talk in activity during young children's use of digital technologies at home. *Australian Journal of Communication* Volume 40 (2).
- Davidson, C. (2012). Ethnomethodology and literacy research: A methodological "road less travelled". *English Teaching*. 11. 26-42.
- Eriksen, S. (2002). Designing for Accountability. Department of Human Work Science and Media Technology. Blekinge Institute of Technology. Box 520, SE-372 25 Ronneby, Sweden
- Habito, C., Briones, R. (2005). Philippine Agriculture over the Years: Performance, Policies and Pitfalls.

- Hennon, C. (2012). *Entrepreneurship, Farming, and Identity: A Phenomenological Inquiry*. DOI: 10.5772/3878.
- Khajeheian, Datis. (2018). *Enterprise Social Media: Ethnographic Research on Communication in Entrepreneurial Teams*. *International Journal of E-Services and Mobile Applications*. 10. 34-46. 10.4018/IJESMA.2018010103.
- Kurniawan, Rendra & Mulawarman, aji dedi & Kamayanti, Ari. (2014). *Biological Assets Valuation Reconstruction: A Critical Study of IAS 41 on Agricultural Accounting in Indonesian Farmers*. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 164. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.11.052.
- Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2017). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Leeuwis, C. & Ban, & den, van. (2004). *Communication for Rural Innovation: rethinking agricultural extension*.
- Noe E., Alrøe H. (2003) *Farm enterprises as self-organizing systems: a new transdisciplinary framework for studying farm enterprises?* *Int. J. Sociol. Agr. Food* 11, 3–14.
- Olszewski, Brandon & Macey, Deborah & Lindstrom, Lauren. (2006). *The Practical Work of Coding: An Ethnomethodological Inquiry*. *Human Studies*. 29. 363-380. 10.1007/s10746-006-9029-2.
- Segumpan, R.G., & Saludadez, J.A. (2018). *Understanding Mediated Intercultural Communication: An Ethnomethodological Study of Social Media Engagement Practices of Asian Expatriates*.
- Stuiver, M. & Leeuwis, C. & Ploeg, Jan. (2003). *The Power of Experience: Farmers' Knowledge and Sustainable Innovations in Agriculture*. *Seeds of Transition: Essays on novelty production, niches and regimes in agriculture*.
- Trace, C. B. (2015). *Ethnomethodology Foundational insights on the nature and meaning of documents in everyday life*. The University of Texas, Austin, Texas, USA. DOI: 10.1108/JD-01-2015-0014.
- Treadwell, D., & Davis, A. (2019). *Introducing Communication Research: Paths of Inquiry*. SAGE Publications. ISBN 1506369057
- Tsourvakas, G. (1997). *Multi-Visual Qualitative Method: Observing Social Groups in Mass Media*. *The Qualitative Report*, 3(3), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/1997.2018>
- University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing. (2013). *Communication in the Real World: An Introduction to Communication Studies*.

Walter, G. (1992). Communication and sustainable agriculture: Building agendas for research and practice. *Agric Hum Values* 9, 27–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02217624>

Watson, R. (2005). Reflexivity, description and the analysis of social settings
Ciências Sociais Unisinos, vol. 41, núm. 1, enero-abril, 2005, pp. 1-6
Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos São Leopoldo, Brasil

Zagado, R.G. (2013). Human Agency, Power, and Discourse: Accomplishing Farm Work Through Short Messaging Service (SMS) in the Philippines. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Adelaide, Australia.