What Norms do Team-based Leadership Development Event Teams use to Create a Culture of Success?

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Science

with a

Major in Agriculture Education

in the

College of Graduate Studies

University of Idaho

by

Thomas A. Jacobsen

Major Professor: Sarah Bush, Ph.D.

Committee Members: James Connors, Ph.D.; Adam Cletzer, Ph.D.

Department Administrator: James Connors, Ph.D.

August 2020

Authorization to Submit Thesis

This thesis of Thomas A. Jacobsen, submitted for the degree of Master of Science with a
Major in Agriculture Education and titled "What Norms do Team-based Leadership
Development Event Teams use to Create a Culture of Success?," has been reviewed in final
form. Permission, as indicated by the signatures and dates below, is now granted to submit
final copies to the College of Graduate Studies for approval.

Major Professor: _____   Date: _____
                                     Sarah Bush, Ph.D.

Committee Members: _____   Date: _____
                                     James Connors, Ph.D.

                             _____   Date: _____
                                     Adam Cletzer, Ph.D.

Department
Administrator: _____   Date: _____
                                     James Connors, Ph.D.

Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative study was to identify norms and culture of team-based Leadership Development Events (LDEs) that qualified for competition in the 2020 Idaho State Virtual LDEs. Differences in team norms and culture from the Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings were extrapolated from interviews of the advisors of the teams. Interviews took place via phone, were voice recorded, and transcribed for analysis. Interviews were open coded in a meaning making process. From the interview data, it was determined that teams whose norms were student driven had more of a team development experience, had more buy-in, and experienced more elements of cooperation. Teams that had advisor-driven norms were more focused on the competition and winning; in addition, individual accountability was a common theme. This information can be used to assist FFA advisors in structuring team development plans.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Sarah Bush for her guidance and support through the whole process of getting through the courses and thesis needed for my master's degree. Without her help I would still be scratching my head wondering what I should be doing. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. James Connors for his support and encouragement. Dr. Adam Cletzer for coming in late in the process and being willing to serve on my committee. The entire faculty of the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education at the University of Idaho for working with me through my course work. I would like to thank the agricultural teachers in Idaho who were willing to talk to me about their experiences. Thank you and know that I appreciate your efforts getting this thesis written.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this to my family who supported me in going back to school. The time I spent working on this was time that I missed being with you. Know that I love you and appreciate your support as I reached for my goals.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Job trends indicate movement away from a manufacturing economy to a service-sector economy at a rapidly increasing rate. The service sector employs 80.2% of the jobs in the U.S. with predicted growth in the next decade to increase one half a percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). In a study about revaluing low-wage work in the service-sector, Pietrykowski (2017) indicated both low-wage and high-wage earners returned a positive wage across all occupations for developing "soft" skills like critical-thinking, problem-solving, and related "abstract cognitive" skills.

Soft skills are non-technical, applied skills that employees are expected to possess and are oftentimes difficult to measure (Stewart et al., 2016). Individuals that can communicate both verbally and in writing, work in teams, lead groups, solve problems, and make decisions are highly sought after (Stewart et al., 2016). Employers can teach the technical competencies for a job but need employees that will show up to work on time, analyze problems, come up with solutions, and be able to communicate effectively to clients and co-workers (Crawford et al., 2011). Soft skills can be broken down into seven different categories including: experiences, team skills, communication skills, leadership skills, decision-making/problem-solving skills, self-management skills, and professionalism skills. Employers rank communication and decision making/problem solving as the most important employability skills (Crawford et al., 2011).

Academic knowledge continues to be pressed in high schools, and rightly so; however, with the need for increased soft skill development another burden has been placed on educators. On top of daily teaching tasks, enhanced educational technology, increased student diversity, decreased school funding, and heightened accountability measures exacerbate stress among educators (Smith & Smalley, 2018). Additionally, educators also face scrutiny from multiple stakeholder groups, each with its own perspectives and expectations (Fullan, 2001; Guglielmi & Tatrow, 1998).

The nature of school-based agricultural education further complicates these issues. With the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, agricultural education has encouraged individualized instruction, utilized innovative and established teaching methods, reached out to community members to ensure community needs are met, conducted home visits, and

prepared students for careers post high school (Hillison, 1987; Moore, 1987; Phipps et al., 2008, Rubenstein et al., 2016). The three-circle model employed by agricultural education includes the classroom/laboratory instruction, the National FFA Organization, and Supervised Agricultural Experiences (SAE). While most teachers focus all efforts in the classroom/laboratory instruction, a typical day for an agricultural teacher includes preparing lessons, setting up labs, ordering supplies, helping students update SAE records, visiting a student's SAE project, meeting with parents, managing budgets, filling out reports, attending professional development or faculty meetings, training officers, holding officer meetings, holding practices for Career Development Events (CDEs) and Leadership Development Events (LDEs), and a list of other duties that vary from school-to-school. Arguably, an agricultural education teacher is expected to fulfill a variety of roles in addition to those of a typical classroom teacher. As such, the workload of teachers in agricultural education extends beyond a typical teacher's work week (Torres et al., 2009).

The nature of agricultural education lends itself to the development of both soft skills and technical skills like welding, animal husbandry, and crop production. Agriculture teachers have an opportunity to fill a need that employers are looking for and students need to develop, the soft skills of communication, teamwork, and experience. As a teacher's workload and stress level increases, it is important to realize the opportunities to fill the needs through the activities they already employ. For agriculture teachers, CDEs and LDEs can be one of the most effective activities that provide experience, develop teamwork, and build communication skills.

As stated in the mission of the National FFA Organization (FFA), "The FFA makes a positive difference in the lives of students by developing their potential for premier leadership, personal growth and career success through agricultural education" (National FFA Organization, n.d.). One way the FFA accomplishes its mission is by developing soft skills in teamwork, communications, human relations, and social interaction (National FFA Organization, n.d.). The experiences are what the students remember about their time in FFA, but the skills developed follow them throughout their lives.

Through preparation for and participation in CDEs and LDEs, students develop a host of soft skills needed for success in careers after high school. These skills include communication, decision-making/problem-solving, self-management, teamwork,

professionalism, experiences, and leadership skills (Crawford et al., 2011). According to Freeman (2017), students that participate in CDEs and LDEs develop better time management, social competence, achievement motivation, intellectual flexibility, task leadership, emotional control, active initiative, and self-confidence when compared to agricultural education students that do not compete in CDEs and LDEs.

Developing Teams and Soft Skills in Secondary-Based Agricultural Education (SBAE)

Management and consulting specialist Patrick Lencioni (2002), in his book *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team,* said "Not finance. Not strategy. Not technology. It is teamwork that remains the ultimate competitive advantage, both because it is so powerful and so rare" (p. vii). As groups and teams become a standard for innovative companies around the world developing the skills to work as a member of a team is becoming more important (Cross & Gray, 2013). If teamwork is so needed in business today and powerful and rare, teaching teamwork to students is of paramount importance. Working with others in groups is not a new idea, nor is teamwork, but bridging the gap between groupwork and teamwork in CDEs and LDEs provide opportunities for FFA members to work in teams.

With the passing of the No Child Left Behind Act in 1995 our education system became a system of accountability. States were required to give standardized tests which measured student achievement in mathematics and English language arts. All students had to achieve proficiency on the state mandatory test, and the schools had to demonstrate adequate yearly progress towards meeting their goals (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). In response to these mandates, many teachers felt the pressure to focus on increasing test scores above all else (Murnane & Papay, 2010). In Idaho, the Idaho Standards Achievement Test or ISAT is the state approved test. The ISAT is a comprehensive assessment system that tests student achievement towards state established standards in English, language arts, math, and science (Idaho State Department of Education, n.d.). Teachers are evaluated on how their students perform on these tests and therefore tend to teach to the test.

While teachers try to create opportunities for students to work in groups, it is often met with opposition from students. "I often hear the collective groan of my students whenever I announce a group project" says VP of Magas Media Consultants and Pace University associate professor Jennifer Lee Magas. "Group projects seem to instill a horror in students

like nothing else - and it's understandable" (Flavin, 2018). Two of the biggest reasons students struggle with group work is they find the activities inefficient and feel resentful about being dependent on peers (Isaac, 2012). Without proper training in teamwork, students will not be prepared to work in a team-oriented environment. Their success in the workplace is dependent on how quickly they learn to collaborate productively. According to Flavin (2018), one way to improve your teamwork skills is to join a team and put yourself in situations that force you to work with others.

One opportunity for FFA students is by competing in a CDE or LDE. These events are designed to develop college- and career-readiness skills. "Through CDEs and LDEs, participating FFA members are challenged to develop critical thinking skills and effective decision-making skills, foster teamwork, and promote communication while recognizing the value of ethical competition and individual achievement" (National FFA Organization, n.d.).

Success, often in the National FFA Organization, is evaluated by the result of how an individual or team performs. For example, in a study conducted by Russell et al. (2009) only the teachers that had the most accumulated points in their two-day state FFA CDE competition were selected as participants to examine motivation for agricultural students in participating in CDEs. In another study Bolton et al. (2018) studied successful secondary agricultural programs outside the classroom. Their target population focused on programs that participated in and consistently placed high in a variety of competitions in FFA. These high placing programs were considered high quality programs. These nonprobability sampling methods allowed researchers to use nonrandom procedures for selecting the members of the sample (Ary et al., 1990). If winning is viewed as our definition of success, we might assume that FFA members and advisors feel unsuccessful more often than successful. FFA members compete in a variety of CDEs and LDEs from the chapter to the national level. In an event like livestock judging, you might have 200 participants per state, yet only four are crowned champions. Under this definition of success in Idaho, only 95 students out of a total of 5,133 would be considered successful (Idaho FFA Association, 2019). Larger states will have lower success rates, while smaller states will have higher success rates. Success cannot therefore be defined as winning a state event if the true goal as defined by the National FFA Organization (n.d.) is to develop skills.

Coach John Wooden said "Success is peace of mind that is the direct result of self-satisfaction in knowing you did your best to become the best that you are capable of becoming" (Wooden & Carty, 2005, p. 12). Success is not only experienced by winning teams but by any team that does their best to become the best they can become. Not all teams come to state events having done their best to become the best they can become; therefore, they cannot experience success or will not experience success at the same level. What about the other teams that do their best to become the best they are capable of being; not all those teams will win, yet, by the definition of success by John Wooden, we see they are successful. So, what is needed to become the best each team can become? Being able to answer this question would provide SBAE teachers with more insight on how to help their students realize and find success without focusing solely on achievement of a prize.

In terms of preparing for a CDE/LDE, development of team norms are the ways in which teams prepare for a competition. As a team, individuals should be able to do more because of the collaboration and energy other members of the team bring. Team norms include prescriptions for behavior, should be important to the group, and enforced through formal rules and procedures (Feldman, 1984). A norm exists in each social setting to the extent that individuals usually act in a certain way and are often punished when seen not to be acting in this way (Axelrod, 1986). The extent to which a given action is a norm depends on how often the action is taken and how often someone is held accountable for not taking it. All teams have norms and while some teams intentionally talk about desired behavior and consequences for inappropriate behavior, other teams fall into the norms, they utilize to carry out the responsibilities of the team (Feldman, 1984).

Norms are specific prescriptions of behavior that a group or team is expected to follow (Feldman, 1984). Culture is the way a group of people is expected to behave (Tosti, 2007). The major difference is norms tell us what the group expects our behavior to be, while culture tells us the process and the practices we should follow. Culture is aligned to the mission and values of the organization. Where groups and teams are results based, poor practices can destroy good processes (Tosti, 2007).

Performance determines what team norms are successful. Social proof is a term developed by Robert Cialdini (2009) in his book *Influence.* Social proof is a phenomenon in which people copy the actions of others to undertake certain behaviors. As teams observe

what other teams are doing, they see things that work well and can imitate those behaviors. Teams that are not high achieving are not considered to be successful and their behaviors are often not imitated. Social proof helps us to define what correct behavior is. The actions of those around us help us determine what correct behavior is. Things like what to do with an empty popcorn box in a theater, how fast you should be driving, or how to fix and eat a taco at a dinner party are all examples of social proof. We view behavior as more correct in each situation to the degree that we see others performing it (Cialdini, 2009). Social proof allows the group to see what behavior is needed. Social proof works best when we view others as we view ourselves.

The organizational alignment of our strategies and mission result in the culture of an organization. The culture, or "the way a group of people prefer to behave" (Tosti, 2007, p. 21) is essential for a sustainable approach to preparing students to be successful in a CDE/LDE. The culture of the agricultural program and the culture in each team must align mission, values, processes, and behaviors in order to get the desired results. What we do matters less than how we do it. The norms, or accepted behaviors must be compatible with the practices that will bring desired results.

Two models of individual traits needed for team success have been established. In the first model John Wooden, the coach of the UCLA men's basketball team that won 10 national championships established the *Pyramid of Success* (Wooden & Carty, 2005). In it are fifteen principles that lead to success. The five principles that make up the foundation of the pyramid include industriousness, friendship, loyalty, cooperation, and enthusiasm. For a team to be successful, the five principles must be present. The next level of principles includes self-control, alertness, initiative, and intentness. Here again, without these principles a team cannot build the next principles of condition, skill and team spirit for the next layer. Poise and confidence make up the next layer, and competitive greatness makes up the final layer of the pyramid (Wooden & Carty, 2005). Each principle of the pyramid of success provides a sure foundation for success. The foundation layer of the pyramid of success includes the virtues of industriousness, friendship, loyalty, cooperation, and enthusiasm. These skills lay the foundation of a great team.

The Five Dysfunctions of a Team discusses the reasons teams fail to be successful (Lencioni, 2002). These hierarchical levels include first an absence of trust. Team members

must trust that their team members have strengths and allow them to utilize their strengths for the benefit of the team. Second, the team should not avoid conflict. Conflict avoidance limits how far a team can go. Third, teams must be committed, they must have a common goal that is important to the whole group. Fourth, team members must hold each other and themselves accountable for the roles and responsibilities they each take on. When they fail to do what they say, they will do they need to be held accountable for the team to achieve success. Finally, the team must be focused on the results. A lack of focus on small things will have great impact on big things. When a team trusts each other, addresses conflict, is committed to a common goal, is accountable, and pays attention to results they will unavoidably find success as a team.

The second model was established by Patrick Lencioni, the CEO of the Table Group, a business designed to meet the organizational and leadership needs of businesses around the world. *The Ideal Team Player* is a set of virtues that make some people better team members than others (Lencioni, 2016). These virtues can be recognized and developed to bring a team together and find success. The three virtues espoused are humble, hungry, and smart. By themselves, each virtue is incomplete and can harm the team they are part of. In order to be the ideal team player that a successful team must have to be successful all three virtues must exist for all members of the team (Lencioni, 2016).

What does it look like when a member of a team is humble, hungry, and smart? We can look to the pyramid of success to see how these virtues relate. An industrious person is hungry, they work hard and plan carefully. Friendship is a virtue that smart people have; they understand they cannot succeed alone. They respect other members and see their strengths as assets to the team. Loyalty is an aspect of humility. They know they need others' skills and abilities to succeed; they depend on others and allow others to depend on them. Cooperation is an aspect of humility as well. They listen to others and seek the best way, not their own way. Enthusiasm is an aspect of hunger. They enjoy what they are doing and motivate others to do it as well.

These foundational virtues are essential for an ideal team player, notice how in order to have a complete foundation in the pyramid of success you also must have all three virtues of an ideal team player. We can follow each level of the pyramid of success and demonstrate how the virtues of an ideal team player fit throughout each layer. In either case, using the

pyramid of success or the ideal team player, several principles can be identified that can be applied to the idea of establishing norms of a team. The purpose of this study is to determine the importance of those principles in creating a culture of success in teamwork.

Significance of the Study

Teamwork is of paramount importance in the world today. Management and consulting specialist Patrick Lencioni (2002), in his book *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team,* said "Not finance. Not strategy. Not technology. It is teamwork that remains the ultimate competitive advantage, both because it is so powerful and so rare" (p. vii). The research done in this study will provide a look inside the workings of teams with high functionality to help them understand the norms that build a culture of success in team-based LDEs. While winning a state contest may be the goal of many advisors, the skills developed as students learn to work with team members will last their entire lives. Focus on teaching these skills will not only help students develop employability skills but will also lead to success in team-based LDEs.

Purposes and Objectives

The purpose of this research is to identify norms and culture of teams competing in team-based LDEs. The idea of social proof in LDEs is that we will mimic the norms of high functioning teams. By identifying those norms, FFA advisors will better instruct their students in developing their own teams, creating a culture throughout the National FFA Organization of improved student teamwork skills.

Research Questions:

1) How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Agricultural Issus Forum teams?
2) How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Parliamentary Procedure teams?
3) How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams?
4) Are there differences in the team norms and culture of teams based on LDE?

Definitions

Agricultural Issues Forum LDE: "Participants research the pros and cons of an agricultural issue and present their findings to a panel of judges" (National FFA Organization, n.d.).

Career Development Event (CDE): A competitive event organized by the National FFA Organization in which students are challenged to develop critical thinking skills and effective decision-making skills, foster teamwork and promote communication while recognizing the value of ethical competition and individual achievement (National FFA Organization, n.d.).

Conduct of Chapter Meetings LDE: An LDE that introduces FFA members to parliamentary procedure as they learn how to conduct efficient meetings and build their communication skills (National FFA Organization, n.d.).

Culture: "The way a group of people prefer to behave" (Tosti, 2007). Common behaviors of high achieving teams.

Group: "Two or more individuals who are connected to one another by social relationships" (Forsyth, 2006, p.2-3)

Leadership Development Event (LDE): A competitive event organized by the National FFA Organization in which students are challenged to develop critical thinking skills and effective decision-making skills, foster teamwork and promote communication while recognizing the value of ethical competition and individual achievement (National FFA Organization, n.d.).

Norms: "Shared group expectations about appropriate behavior" (Muchinsky & Howes, 2009, p. 259)

Objective Success: Success that is measurable, results based, and can be verified by a third party (Abele et al., 2016).

Parliamentary Procedure LDE: An LDE in which students are evaluated on their ability to conduct an orderly and efficient meeting using parliamentary procedure (National FFA Organization, n.d.).

Subjective Success: Success that is less measurable, process based, and self-reported (Heslin, 2003).

Success: "Success is peace of mind that is the direct result of self-satisfaction in knowing you did your best to become the best that you are capable of becoming" (Wooden & Carty, 2005).

Team: "An organized, task-focused group" (Forsyth, 2006, p. 159) that has structure to aid in reaching goals and has high levels of interaction, interdependence, and belongingness (Franz, 2012).

Overview of the Design

      This research will use qualitative research techniques. In researching a topic such as this, the inquiry must be objective in recognizing specific norms established in successful groups but recognize the personal experiences in how these norms come to fruition. The advisors of the LDE teams in this study have formed and created the norms they use throughout the preparation for their events, gone through the conflict that all teams go through to establish themselves as a team, and performed at a common event, the Idaho State Virtual LDEs held in 2020. Four advisors from three different LDEs that had teams qualify for and/or competed in the virtual LDEs were randomly selected and interviewed in this study. Targeted participants were FFA advisors from FFA chapters that competed and qualified for the Idaho State Virtual LDEs in the Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings. The interviews aimed to examine culture and norms of these teams that emerged through preparation for the event.

      These three LDEs were selected based on the results from the contest requiring that the teams compete together in at least one portion of the contest. The Agricultural Issues Forum is an emerging event in Idaho. The first event was held in 2010, however, no more than six teams have competed at the state level. Teams in the Agricultural Issues forum develop their issue, write their portfolio, and present their issue to local forums.

      Parliamentary Procedure in Idaho is very competitive. Teams take a written test individually, then present an impromptu meeting concerning a motion that is brought up in an FFA meeting. They demonstrate a variety of motions, debate the pros and cons of the various motions, and vote to accept or reject the motions. Members must work together to effectively communicate their ideas and perspectives of the motion. After their meeting, they each answer a question concerning parliamentary law.

      Conduct of Chapter meetings is much different than the other two contests. First, members are between 7th and 9th grade. Much like Parliamentary Procedure, teams take a test, present items in a meeting, and answer questions, however, in addition to these parts of the contest the students must memorize and recite the opening and closing ceremonies for the FFA during their meeting.

      The COVID-19 pandemic forced school closures during March 2020. These events normally held at the Idaho State FFA Leadership Convention the first week of April each year

were cancelled. The Idaho FFA Board of Directors met and allowed each event to be held virtually in June at the Idaho State FFA Virtual LDEs.

Each LDE is different in how success is measured. In the Agriculture Issues Forum and Conduct of Chapter Meetings, teams are ranked from the top to the bottom. Only one round takes place at the state level, so the stakes are high for the teams that compete. In Parliamentary Procedure the top four teams are selected from the first round to compete in a finals round. In both Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings only one team from each district can compete at the state event, so a sorting process at each district takes place to select the team that will compete at the state event. In 2020 the format was adjusted to one round only due to limited participation in the virtual event.

Advisors were selected for participation using a random number generator. Four advisors from each LDE will be interviewed. Teams that qualified for participation at the state event were in the study. Not all teams that qualified to participate did based on technology issues as well as health and safety concerns from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Error Related to Subject Selection

The elimination of bias when selecting the teams for this study has been thoughtfully considered. Advisors will be selected using a random number generator with each advisor being assigned a number, thus eliminating bias from the subject selection.

Limitations

The researcher acknowledges the following limitations of the study:

1. This study will only include secondary agriculture education teachers, teaching in Idaho who coached an Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, or Conduct of Chapter Meetings team, which competed at the state level in 2020.
2. Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams both have had to compete at the district level to advance to the state level, so several chapters that had teams during the 2019-2020 school year were not included in the research.
3. Very little research has been done on the Agricultural Issues Forum.
4. Data is self-reported.
5. To maintain a competitive advantage, some advisors may withhold or misrepresent requested information in the interview.

Assumptions

1. Participants in the study will provide useful data and honest responses.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The following review aims to contextualize team development through the lens of team-based Leadership Development Event (LDE) teams and provide a review of literature relevant to the research questions. To accomplish this purpose, an overview of team-based LDE teams and is given. Then a theoretical framework of team development and team functionality will be reviewed.

Defining Success

Success can be defined two separate ways, objectively and subjectively. Objective success is measurable, results based, and can be verified by a third party (Abele et al., 2016). Subjective success is less measurable, process based, and self-reported (Heslin, 2003). In the FFA, when students win a state contest, we would consider that an objective success. In Idaho, the students are awarded with a plaque, a travel stipend to the National FFA Convention, and a scholarship from the University of Idaho College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. This objective success, achievement, is something that most FFA members strive for, but only a few get to experience. Subjective success is possible for every student that competes in a CDE/LDE. Subjective success might look like a student getting through their speech without any awkward pauses or might include a team working together to solve a difficult problem. No awards are given out to these individuals, but they are still able to feel a sense of accomplishment and success. Through this process of subjective success, FFA members often develop soft skills. The development of soft skills like leadership, verbal and non-verbal communication, cooperation, and teamwork will help these students throughout their lives.

Career Development Events (CDEs) and Leadership Development Events (LDEs)

National judging contests for agricultural education students were established before the Future Farmers of America, presently FFA, was established in 1928. Contests were established to motivate students to prepare for work in production agriculture. For the first 40 years, the FFA had only six judging contests, but as federal law changed to allow for off-farm agricultural occupational training with the Vocational Education Act of 1963, an expansion of the contests began. Six contests were added in the 1970's, one in the 1980's, eight in the 1990's, four in the 2000's, and two more in the 2010's (Jones & Edwards, 2019). As the country changed, so did the FFA. By the 1980's the American population was no longer

production agriculture based. The National Research Council (NRC) called for contests to be evaluated and establish educational objectives (NRC, 1988). A focus on preparation for a career in production agriculture has morphed into a focus on developing skills needed for employment in the agricultural industries, but also a focus on agricultural literacy (NRC, 1988).

A career focus has been one of the main focuses of agricultural education since its inception with the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 (Moore & Borne, 1985; Talbert & Balschweid, 2006; Talbert et al., 2005). Vocational Agriculture and the Future Farmers of America have adapted with the times in many ways. Names have changed from Vocational Agriculture to Career and Technical Education (CTE), and the Future Farmers of America has changed to the National FFA Organization, but preparing youth to be productive citizens and assume leadership roles in their communities continues to be a major focus (Reese, 2003). The mission of the National FFA Organization is "FFA makes a positive difference in the lives of students by developing their potential for premier leadership, personal growth and career success through agricultural education" (National FFA Organization, n.d.). Through the mission, agricultural teachers and FFA advisors find direction about how to prepare students for their future.

CDEs and LDEs are one of the tools the FFA uses to help students recognize skills needed in a variety of careers and develop those skills while in high school. In addition to specific career-related skills, research has found that some of the most important skills developed through CDEs and LDEs are teamwork and responsibility (Blakely et al., 1993). In her recent doctoral dissertation, Freeman (2017) indicated FFA members who participated in the Opening and Closing Ceremonies contest demonstrated significant improvement in soft skills such as time management, social competence, intellectual flexibility, emotional control, active initiative, and self-confidence. Teachers and students agree that participating in CDEs help students develop employability skills (Boardman-Smith & Garton, 2008, Lundry et al., 2015).

Each CDE and LDE has different characteristics. Table 2.1 explains the characteristics of the different events held in Idaho. Three LDEs are team-based, Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings. These LDEs have a large portion where students work together to accomplish a task. They each provide structure to help the

team accomplish their task, and each have a high level of interdependence. As such, they would be considered a team rather than a group (Franz, 2012).

Table 2.1. Idaho FFA CDE and LDE Characteristics

Event Name	Event Type	Number of Team Members	Team Presentation	Individual Portion of Event?
Agricultural Communications	CDE	4	Yes	Yes
Agricultural Issues Forum	LDE	3-7	Yes	No
Agricultural Mechanics	CDE	4	No	Yes
Agricultural Sales	CDE	4	No	Yes
Agronomy	CDE	4	No	Yes
Conduct of Chapter Meetings	LDE	7	Yes	Yes
Creed Speaking	LDE	1	No	Yes
Dairy Cattle Evaluation and Management	CDE	4	No	Yes
Dairy Cattle Handler's Activity	CDE	1	No	Yes
Employment Skills	LDE	1	No	Yes
Entomology	CDE	4	No	Yes
Environmental Natural Resources	CDE	4	No	Yes
Extemporaneous Public Speaking	LDE	1	No	Yes
Farm and Agribusiness Management	CDE	4	No	Yes
Floriculture	CDE	4	No	Yes
Food Science and Technology	CDE	4	Yes	Yes
Forestry	CDE	4	No	Yes
Horse Evaluation	CDE	4	No	Yes
Livestock Evaluation	CDE	4	No	Yes
Marketing Plan	CDE	4	Yes	No
Meats Evaluation and Technology	CDE	4	No	Yes
Milk Quality and Products	CDE	4	No	Yes

Nursery/Landscape	CDE	4	No	Yes
Parliamentary Procedure	LDE	6	Yes	Yes
Poultry Evaluation	CDE	4	No	Yes
Prepared Public Speaking	LDE	1	No	Yes
Rangeland Evaluation	CDE	4	No	Yes
Soils Judging	CDE	4	No	Yes
Veterinary Science	CDE	4	No	Yes

Agricultural Issues Forum

The Agricultural Issues Forum is one of several LDEs sponsored by the National FFA Organization. Teams research the pros and cons of an agricultural issue and present their findings to a panel of judges (National FFA Organization, N.D.). In order to compete in the Agricultural Issues Forum, teams must research a topic of current concern in the agricultural community, prepare a portfolio and group presentation, present their presentation to a minimum of five high quality community forums, and answer questions concerning the issue. The rules are specific about what qualifies an event as high quality. To be considered high-quality, an event must be made to community groups that would have an interest in the issue, presentations must be independently documented, and should not be made as part of a local or state FFA competition (National FFA Organization, N.D.). The team presentation should include participation of each member, creativity of how main points are made, quality and power of the presentation, and effective use of props that do not reduce the focus of the content of the presentation. A five-point deduction will be given to any team that draws a conclusion during the formal presentation, but during the questions a team member may draw a conclusion supporting a pro or con viewpoint if asked by a judge (National FFA Organization, N.D.).

The teams in the Agricultural Issues Forum have between three and seven members. The amount of innovation is up to the team members, for example they can present their forums in creative ways, be in official dress, or in costume, and use props if they want. Because of the nature of the LDE, a collaborative approach to team building is essential (National FFA Organization, N.D.).

Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings

Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings are team-based LDEs that teach the practical use of parliamentary law in civic meetings. While Conduct of Chapter Meetings is designed for younger FFA members to learn how to conduct FFA chapter meetings, Parliamentary Procedure is designed for older FFA members to develop a deeper knowledge and breadth of skills concerning parliamentary law. Only students in grades 7-9 can participate in Conduct of Chapter Meetings. Students memorize and present the FFA Opening Ceremonies and demonstrate and debate an abbreviated set of motions. In each LDE, students must present and debate several motions to demonstrate their knowledge of parliamentary law. In this event, each LDE student takes a parliamentary knowledge test and individual scores are added to the team presentation score.

Parliamentary Procedure teams are made up of six members, while Conduct of Chapter Meeting teams are made up of seven members. Teamwork is the basis for competition in both events, students must work with each other to complete the team presentation. If one student fails to debate, make their assigned motion, or use a motion incorrectly, the entire team score is impacted. Falk et al. (2014) found that the more time individuals spend practicing and preparing the better their team scores will be. Team scores are directly influenced by team member assimilation. Because of the nature of these LDEs, collaborative approach to team building is essential.

FFA Advisors

FFA advisors or other coaches that help prepare an Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, or Conduct of Chapter Meetings team are essential to fostering team development. Coaches engage the team in a variety of behaviors to encourage team effectiveness such as, providing structure and direction, identifying and providing the resources needed for team success, and removing roadblocks to team success (Bowling, 2010). Coaches are required to make corrections, impart knowledge, reinforce desired behaviors, and motivate effort. The amount of time spent directing the actions of the team can be immense, and as such, effectiveness in applying these skills will impact the successes the team experiences.

Communication, leadership, and teamwork skills are critical to event success. Students must learn to work together, overcome personal bias, research the issue from multiple

perspectives, collaborate with team members to create an innovative presentation that clearly communicates the multiple dimensions of the issue, all while professionally representing themselves, their team, and their school. "These are today's survival skills-not only for career success but also for a quality personal and civic life" (Soule & Warrick, 2015, p.178).

Current Research on Team-based Leadership Development Events

No current research has been done directly on the Agricultural Issues Forum. Research on motivation of FFA members to compete on CDE teams has shown advisors use a variety of motivational techniques to develop competitive drive and content knowledge (Ball et al., 2016; Russell et al., 2009). Students and advisors that competed in the California Opening and Closing Ceremony contest gained more soft skills than those who did not participate (Freeman, 2017).

Theoretical Foundation

Team Development

Team development has been a major area of study for researchers (Fisher, 1970; Hurt & Trombley, 2007; Lewin, 1947; McClure, 2005; McGrath, 1991; Morgan et al., 1993; Poole, 1981, 1983; Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman & Jensen, 1977; Wheelan, 2009). The goal of most research on team development is to learn why and how teams change over time. Table 2.2 lists the major group and team development models. Natural groupings of models can be made by defining the model as linear, cyclical, or non-phasic. An argument can be made that teams go through phases or stages. Most stages follow an orientation or forming phase in which groups come together. Most orientation stages are relatively unproductive in terms of task accomplishment, however interpersonal relationships and communication are important in this stage.

A stage of conflict follows in which teams disagree on how to proceed and what roles members should have. This conflict stage is followed by a stage of task performance. Individuals identify their roles; the teams determine a set of behaviors that they agree on, either implicitly or explicitly that they agree to follow. Activity, goal and task achievement, and productivity mark the next stage. Several researchers have identified a final stage of the team disbanding. This final stage is marked by individuals expressing appreciation for each other, passing the leadership torch. Tuckman and Jensen's (1977) revised small group development encompasses each of these stages, and although one could argue the cyclical

nature of group development, their model captures most closely what all researchers say about group development.

Table 2.2. Leadership Group and Team Development Models

Model Name	Authors	Phases	Description of Model
Individual Change Process	Lewin, 1947	Unfreezing, Change, & Freezing	A linear model of change where groups overcome an existing mind set, go through a period of confusion and transition, then develop a comfort level with the new mind set.
Stages Model	Tuckman, 1965	Forming, Storming, Norming, & Performing	A linear model of team building. The sequential stages (forming, storming, norming, and performing) involve two aspects: Interpersonal relationships and task behaviors.
Revised Stages Model	Tuckman & Jensen, 1977	Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing, & Adjourning	A linear model of team building. This model adds to the Stages Model by Tuckman the adjourning stage where the group disbands. A celebration of successes is a signature of this stage. Leaders transfer into supporting roles in order to expand the initiative.
Systems Model	Tubbs, 2012	Orientation, Conflict, Consensus, & Closure	A linear model of decision making. Group members talk about the problem, develop new ideas through conflict, come to a consensus, then reaffirm their support of the decision.
Theory of Decision Emergence in Groups	Fisher, 1970	Orientation, Conflict, Emergence, & Reinforcement	Decision-making process is more cyclical than linear. Interpersonal demands of discussion require breaks from task work.

Multiple-Sequences Model	Poole, 1981 & 1983	Task Track, Relation Track, Topic Track, Breakpoints	Continuously developing threads of activities. Discussions are not characterized by phases, but by intertwining tracts of activity and interaction.
Time, Interaction, and Performance (TIP) Theory	McGrath, 1991	Mode I: Inception, Mode II: Technical Problem Solving, Mode III: Conflict Resolution, Mode IV: Execution	Modes are potential, not required. Mode I and IV are in all groups while II and III may or may not be involved in a group.
Group Systems Theory	von Bertalanffy, 1950	Inputs, Throughputs, Outputs, & Feedback	Change occurs in a natural systems-based method. All components of life are interconnected. A change in one area could result in changes to an apparently unrelated area.
Punctuated Equilibrium Model	Gersick, 1991	Phase I, Midpoint, Phase 2	Little visual progress gets made while the group forms until they redefine their initial framework. A second period of movement takes place in which progress is seen.
Integrated Model of Group Development	Wheelan, 2009	Stage 1 Dependency and Inclusion, Stage II Counter dependency and Fight, Stage III Trust/Structure, Stage IV Work/Productivity, Final	An integrated model of group development in which groups achieve maturity as they continue to work together rather than simply going through stages of activity.
Team Evolution and Maturation (TEAM) Model	Morgan et al, 1993	Performing, Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing I, Reforming, Performing II, Conforming, Deforming	Series of nine developmental stages. Periods are relatively informal, indistinctive, and overlapping. Teams are not always expected to develop in a linear fashion through all the stages.

Tuckman's Model

In his seminal work about team development, Tuckman (1965) describes four stages teams go through as they work to become successful. These stages are commonly referred to as forming, storming, norming, and performing. Testing and dependence, the forming stage, consists of individuals in the group feeling out the roles and norms they will have, additionally the individuals get to know and feel one another out. The storming phase or intragroup conflict follows as individuals express emotional response to task demands. Development of group cohesion, the norming stage, follows as individuals establish behaviors that allows the group to continue and seek harmony. It is the final stage of functional role relatedness, the performing stage, in which teams focus on tasks and work together to accomplish them (Tuckman, 1965). A fifth and final stage adjourning, was added later as Tuckman realized that all teams or groups come to an end (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977).

A more integrated form of team development was described by Wheelen (2009). While many of the stages of development align with Tuckman's (1965) model, Wheelen (2009) explains that groups may move around within the stages, going from one stage to another, moving back, and sometimes, never getting to the performing stage. At the state agricultural issue forum, the teams that compete have reached the performing level at least once before they arrive.

High achieving students dislike group work. Yet the need for interaction between peers in school translates into success in the workplace (Isaac, 2012). Graduates are entering a workforce where a higher emphasis is placed on non-technical skills (Murti, 2014) knowing that employers are willing to train employees the technical skills, but skills like collaboration, communication, problem solving, adaptability, and conflict resolution are more difficult to train.

Developing a system in which teams thrive as unexpected changes occur is one element of high performing-teams (Sverdrup et al., 2017). Teams that complete their formative phase quickly will be more effective at identifying problems and providing solutions, they will have higher-quality outputs as opposed to teams that use more time in the formative phase of development (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004). In an event such as the

Agricultural Issues Forum, teams that spend their time identifying an issue, figuring out how to present their issue, when and who to present their issue to, and who will be on the team and what role they will have will spend less time on presenting their issue, ironing out problems they encounter, and answering questions related to their issue. High-performing Agricultural Issues teams should spend 33% or less of their time in the formative phase (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004).

Mobilization strategies for groups should include content clarification, process formation, staffing, and outreach (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004). In an Agricultural Issues Forum setting, content clarification should include deciding on the scope and requirements of your issue, gathering support information, and creating working documents. The process formation should include developing work plans with deadlines that the team will follow. Staffing should include defining roles and selecting and acquiring members. Outreach should include who could help the team complete its work plans and which stakeholders have vested interests in our issue.

Measuring outcomes is essential for high-performing teams. Outcomes can be described as time, task, and talent (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004). Three questions we could ask to evaluate the three T's of outcomes could be, how much time do we have? What tasks need to be completed for the team to be termed successful? How committed are team members to learning and performing their roles? The shared vision of time, task, and talent among team members is consistent with a team that is in the performing stage.

Social Comparison Theory

Shared norms emerge from interpersonal interactions, during which individuals reduce uncertainty and conflict by adapting their individual attitudes and opinions. This social influence on attitudes and opinions is known as Social Comparison Theory (SCT). Research by Sherif et al. (1955) and Festinger (1954) demonstrate how small groups of individuals tend to develop shared norms. Festinger (1954) developed Social Comparison Theory demonstrating how individuals constantly compare their opinions, attitudes, and beliefs with others. The drive for self-evaluation concerning one's opinions and abilities has implications not only for the behavior of persons in groups but also for the processes of formation of groups and changing membership of groups (Festinger, 1954). Another axiom of Festinger (1954) is that when a communicated position falls within an individual's latitude of

acceptance, the individual will strive to reduce the social difference with the object of comparison. This assimilation allows a group to move forward with tasks and goals more effectively.

Building from Tuckman's model of group development, the Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams will inevitably go through each stage of forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). As Wheelen stated, some teams may never make it to the performing stage. They may regress from a norming stage back to a storming stage in the team development (Wheelen, 2009).

Forming. The forming stage of a team will begin at different times of the year for all teams. In Agricultural Issues Forum, the forming stage will include the creation of a team, adding new members to a team that has already been created, and will happen as a team narrows their focus (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977) to a single-issue facing agriculture. Group size has a direct impact on effectiveness. According to Wheelen (2009), groups containing three to six members are significantly more productive than groups with seven to ten members. In the Agricultural Issues Forum teams can be anywhere from three to seven members. Consideration should be given to how effective the team can be with more members. At the national Agricultural Issues Forum LDE from 2016 through 2019 the average number of team members was six. Teams placing gold averaged 6.625 members per team. In addition, most chapters that competed at the National FFA Convention have done so more than one time, with only three states having a different chapter competing each of the last four years. This indicates that a culture of team development is strong for those teams that compete at national Agricultural Issues Forum.

Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings differ in that the team size is set at six for Parliamentary Procedure and seven for Conduct of Chapter Meetings. The forming stage for these teams are like Agricultural Issues Forum teams as each team must first be created. For teams that have come back after not winning the year before forming might include replacing graduated team members with new members. Each team will have to gain the knowledge about parliamentary law and learn to debate using public speaking skills.

Storming. The storming stage for teams can begin at any time throughout the development of the team (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). In Agricultural Issues Forum teams

storming occurs as individuals interact and feel threatened by the issue, other members of the team, or by the direction the team takes as it begins dissecting the issue. Storming is a result of individuals searching out how they fit in the team, the comfort zone of team members is stretched as are the biases about their issue (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977).

Similarly, in Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams must learn to interact with each other effectively. As the comfort zone of each individual member gets encroached on, storms will rise, causing contention within the team. The advisor is essential during the storming process especially when contentious communication between team members occurs. Without a team leader who insists the group meet and openly discuss ways that keep the team focused on learning, and who facilitates these discussions in ways that keep the team focused on learning, teams in which members have a propensity for contentious communication may fail to have open and frank discussions about the team's interaction processes they require to learn from their experiences (Schaudbroeck et al., 2016).

Effective team learning involves raising doubts, seeking feedback, reflecting, and engaging in experimentation (Schauldbroeck et al., 2016). Thus, it requires that members are willing and able to freely share their views, listen to one another, and demonstrate a willingness to reconsider their own views and integrate them with others (Burke et al., 2008; Edmondson, 1999; Schaudbroeck et al., 2016). In each team-based LDE the storming phase will allow teams that survive, the opportunity to communicate more effectively, identify areas of weakness, and provide a means for overcoming those weaknesses.

Norming. The norming stage for teams begins when team members "hunker down" and begin to work (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). In the Agricultural Issues Forum norming includes settling on an issue, deciding on how to research the issue, formation of roles for team members, and deciding how each member fits into the presentation. In Parliamentary Procedure norms include selecting a chairman, creating a plan of attack for each type of motion, and establishing rules for debate on their team. In Conduct of Chapter Meetings norms include deciding on an office for each member, mutual agreement on individual preparation, creating a plan of attack for each motion, and establishing rules for debate on their own team.

Norms are essential for an optimal development and functioning of groups. Adherence to group norms refers to an individuals' behavior coinciding with a group norm (Tauber &

Sassenberg, 2012). Adherence to group norms is an expression of task commitment, which has been demonstrated to be the most important component of cohesiveness (Carron et al., 2002, Mullen & Copper, 1994).

Social Comparison Theory (SCT) states that individuals in a group look to one another to help form opinions, behaviors, and beliefs of others and to determine if their own opinions, behaviors, and beliefs are appropriate. People tend to move toward groups in which they have shared opinions, beliefs, and behaviors. Contrastingly, the more their opinions, beliefs, and behaviors differ the further they distinguish themselves from the group (Van Rooy et al., 2016).

Expectations, values, and behaviors are central to how norms are defined. According to Axelrod (1986), "A norm exists in a given social setting to the extent that individuals usually act in a certain way and are often punished when seen not to be acting in this way" (p. 1097). Based on this definition, norms can change. They change based on how often an action is taken and how often someone is punished when they do not follow the action (Axelrod, 1986).

Norms established early on in group formation may be critical for team development and effectiveness. The group's first meeting may set lasting precedents for how the group will use its time (Gersick, 1991). This "primacy" described by Feldman (1984), states "the first behavior pattern that emerges in a group often sets group expectations" (p. 51). While group norms usually develop gradually and informally as group members learn what behaviors increase group effectiveness, it is also possible to short-cut the process by conscious group decision (Hackman, 1992).

Performing. Performing is a stage in which minimal emotional interference is made because the team is focused on completing the task (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). Performing can occur at any time, indicators of performing on an Agricultural Issues Forum team include team members asking questions about their issue and finding the answers to questions on their own. They might include presenting their forum for a community organization and finding holes in their logic, problem solving with other team members on how to fill those holes, and actively working to learn their parts so they can effectively communicate their perspective at the next forum.

On a Parliamentary Procedure team performing might look like team members running through a meeting on their own, noticing they are over time, and creating a plan to reduce their time. Performing may also look like team members actively working together to make their presentation more logical for an audience. Performing teams will have each member internally motivated to be successful in their competitions.

A Conduct of Chapter Meetings team might spend extra time outside of practice working with each other on perfecting their opening ceremonies, quizzing each other on the chart of motions, or problem solving with teammates on how to meet the time requirements for the presentation. Performing teams will spend their time solving problems together rather than pointing a finger of blame for mistakes.

Adjourning. Adjourning occurs at the completion of the state event for all teams but one. Many times, the team members come back for another try at being first at state in another year, but almost without fail, there will always be new team members the following year. Adjourning is often marked with a celebration (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977).

This adjourning phase is one in which further study should be pursued. Do the team members feel a sense of accomplishment in what they have done? Each team has presented an issue to a minimum of three community forums. Do they feel like they made a difference? Do they feel like they have educated the community? Do they feel like they learned all that they could have learned? Do they feel like they did everything they could do so that they could perform the best they could? Regardless of their placing, do they feel like they experienced success?

Culture

Organizational culture is possibly the most critical factor determining an organization's capacity, effectiveness, and longevity (Woodbury, 2005). Capacity to remain effective from year-to-year, regardless of the students who become members of a team-based LDE team is critical to understand if you want the results the team is seeking. Just as collaboration is one of the essential skills learned by an agriculture issues forum team, collaboration is the key to establishing capacity, effectiveness, and longevity for a program to remain successful from year-to-year (Woodbury, 2005). Reaching a shared vision can only be accomplished with language and process that promotes inclusion and connection of everyone concerned (Woodbury, 2005). People invest in their own vision; if that vision is a result of

collaboration, investment in the organization will occur. That investment will result in organizational culture.

Team Functionality

Lencioni's (2002) Five Dysfunctions of a Team offers a theoretical construct identifying five essential functions of a team: (1) trust, (2) dealing with conflict, (3) commitment, (4) accountability, and (5) attention to results. Trust, or "the individual's belief or a common belief among a group of individuals that another individual or group (a) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit or implicit, (b) is honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments, and (c) does not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available" (Tyler & Kramer, 1996, p. 303). When team members trust each other, they can stay focused on the problems they are solving (Larson & LaFasto, 1989). Conflict arises on teams when members have varying or opposing viewpoints (Dyer et al., 2013). Effectively managing conflict leads to team functionality, while unresolved conflict can destroy functionality (Dyer et al., 2013). Commitment to the team and organization lead to functionality (Dyer et al., 2013; Varney, 1989). Larson and LaFasto (1989) found that low functioning teams have members that place their own interests above the team-interest. Members of functional teams hold themselves and their teammates accountable (Covey, 2006). Team members understand that each member is expected to fulfil their responsibilities and that "slackers or poor performers won't just slip by" (Covey, 2006, p. 203). A common goal that each team member can articulate is the final element of a functional team (Luecke, 2004). "Teams should be designed around the results to be achieved" (Larson & LaFasto, 1989, p. 42). When combined, these five elements of a functional team provide direction for teams that are not achieving the desired results.

Perceptions of Team Members

According to Johnson & Johnson (1999), the five essential elements of cooperative learning include (1) positive interdependence, (2) individual accountability, (3) face-to-face promotive interaction, (4) social skills, and (5) group processing. Positive interdependence occurs when team members recognize they cannot succeed unless the team succeeds (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Individual accountability exists when each member of the team is assessed and the results are given to the group and the individual (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Face-to-face promotive interaction happens when individuals within the team support, assist, help,

encourage, and praise other's efforts to achieve (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Highly cooperative teams have individuals that have social skills like leadership, decision-making, communication, trust-building, and conflict-management skills. Many times, these skills must be taught as just telling team members to cooperate will not guarantee cooperation (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Group processing occurs when team members discuss their progress towards common goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).

The ability of a team-based LDE team to find both objective and subjective success will depend to a large extent on cooperation. Team members must recognize their interdependence on each other, that they can only succeed if everyone on the team is working together and supporting each other. Advisors must train teams to work together to solve problems, communicate, resolve conflicts, and make decisions. Finally, for teams to find success they need to engage with each other and talk about progress towards goals, to identify, define and solve problems they have effectively.

Chapter Summary

Business and industry continue to be concerned that employees have the employability skills needed to succeed in our world today. The soft skills of communication, teamwork, and problem solving are skills that are taught to students who compete in team-based LDEs offered through the FFA. Throughout the literature on team development common themes of forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning continue to be brought up. Each team develops differently with varying amounts of time spent in different stages and for some teams, repeating or not entering stages may occur. The idea that teams can achieve more when focused on a common goal and then working cooperatively to achieve the goal is evidenced by the research. The team-based LDEs offer a glimpse into team development that FFA advisors can utilize to establish norms of behavior and a culture of high achievement that can benefit students as they transition into business and industry.

Chapter 3: Methods

Research Design

I designed a qualitative case study with semi-structured phone interviews with 12 FFA advisors to examine team development in three team-based LDEs, Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings. FFA advisors were randomly selected based on teams that qualified for the Idaho FFA State Parliamentary Procedure or Conduct of Chapter Meetings LDE competitions or competed in the Idaho FFA Virtual Agricultural Issues Forum LDE competition. The audio-recorded interviews included 18 questions from a predetermined protocol that was developed using previous literature. All audio recordings were transcribed verbatim. An open-coding and axial coding process were utilized to make meaning and identify emergent themes.

FFA advisors are typically educated at a university and have either a bachelor's or master's degree. Although training programs differ, all advisors learn a variety of subjects relating to agricultural science, business, mechanics, and communication. This training helps advisors to understand much of the content found in CDEs and LDEs. Many advisors participated in FFA and competed in CDEs as students, however, some advisors had no prior experience of FFA or CDE competitions.

Target Population

The target population was FFA advisors that had teams qualify for competition or competed at the Idaho FFA Virtual LDEs in the Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings in June of 2020. Every chapter in Idaho may compete in the Agricultural Issues Forum without qualifying at the district level. However, in Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings each district may send one qualified team, for a maximum of ten teams each.

These interviews focus only on three LDEs in which teamwork and collaboration occur during the event. I excluded CDEs or LDEs that utilize each team member's score to create a composite without the team members working together as a part of the CDE or LDE. This left three LDEs: Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings.

Every chapter in Idaho may compete in the Agricultural Issues Forum without qualifying at the district level. However, in Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings each district may send one qualified team, for a maximum of ten teams each. Individuals in Agricultural Issues Forum may be in 7th-12th grade as they compete at SLC. Individuals competing in Parliamentary Procedure may also be in 7th-12th grades, however, they are usually in grades 10-12. Individuals competing in Conduct of Chapter Meetings may only be in grades 7th-9th. During normal circumstances, once a team wins the state event the same students are no longer eligible to compete in the same event at the state level, however, the Idaho FFA Board of Directors decided that because there is no national event this year, members will be eligible to compete again at the state level and have a chance to advance to the national level in 2021 even if they win in 2020.

Sample

Four advisors of teams that competed or qualified for one of the three team-based LDEs, Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter meetings were randomly selected for participation in the interviews. A random number generator was utilized and each team that qualified to participate at the Idaho state-level competition for Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings was assigned a number. Four numbers were drawn and the team's advisor(s) that trained the team were invited to participate in an interview.

School closures as a result of COVID-19 across Idaho were taking place during the time these events would have normally taken place. As a result, these events were moved to an online format. Table 3.1 explains the sample utilized in this study. In the Agricultural Issues Forum four teams competed, but one team was excluded because the researcher was the advisor for that team. Because of this, only three team's advisors were interviewed. One team had two advisors that trained the team, so both advisors were interviewed for a total of four interviews of advisors from the Agricultural Issues Forum. In the Conduct of Chapter Meetings LDE four advisors were contacted to be interviewed, however, one advisor could not be reached, so another advisor from the pool was randomly selected to be interviewed. Of the 10 teams that qualified to compete at the state level only five teams competed. One of the four advisors that were interviewed had a team compete at the state level, the other teams chose not to compete because of the impacts school closures had on the team being able to

meet and prepare for the state event. In the Parliamentary Procedure LDE, four advisors were contacted and interviewed. Of the ten teams that qualified to compete at the state level only five teams competed. This was a choice by each school. Three of the four advisors interviewed had teams compete at the state level, the other advisor had a team qualify for competition, but did not compete.

Table 3.1. Explanation of Sampled Advisors

	Agricultural Issues Forum	Parliamentary Procedure	Conduct of Chapter Meetings
Teams registered for SLC	6	10	10
Teams registered for Virtual LDEs	4	5	5
Teams competed in Virtual LDEs	4	5	5
Advisors interviewed	4	4	4
Teams represented in interviews	3	4	4
Advisors interviewed whose team competed in Virtual LDEs	4	3	1

Interviews

The purpose of the interviews was to identify common norms teams use to create a culture of high team functionality in the Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings LDEs in Idaho. The interviews were semi-structured utilizing a predetermined protocol. The protocol was developed based on previous scholarship. The interviews were conducted via phone and took between 20 and 45 minutes. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Field notes were also collected throughout and after the interview. To increase the trustworthiness of the study, member checking was employed following the data analysis.

Table 3.2 is the list of preset questions. The questions are divided into categories about norms and culture.

Table 3.2. Questions for Interviews

Question Type	Question	Source
Norms - General Across the three types of LDE Teams	How did the team members interact with each other?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	How did your team decide on a practice schedule?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	How long did it take for everyone on the team to get on the same page?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	How was everyone held accountable for preparation?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	What was the expectation for outside practice preparation?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	Describe how your team demonstrated dedication.	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	How did individual members of the team show support to the other members of the team?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	How often did your team come together to practice?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	How did your team communicate with each other and with you (the advisor)?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	Describe how your team handled conflict.	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	Did your team establish a common goal when the team formed?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	How often did your team assess progress towards their goal(s)?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
	How did your team make assignments?	Johnson & Johnson (1999)
Culture - General Across the three types of LDE Teams	What words would you use to describe your team?	Tosti (2007)
	What made this team special?	Tosti (2007)
	Is this LDE a common one for your chapter to participate in?	Tosti (2007)
	How competitive is it for students to become members of this LDE team?	Tosti (2007)
Other Questions	How did your team decide on your issue? (Agricultural Issues)	

The three LDEs are traditionally held at the Idaho FFA State Leadership Convention in April, however, school closures led to cancelling SLC. The Idaho FFA Board of Directors met via Zoom to reschedule the events, but with some schools having no contact with students and lack of internet availability with many students the decision was made to delay the events with the hope that the events could be held in person. When it was clear that in person events were not going to happen, the Board of Directors made the decision to hold the events virtually. The events were postponed two months and held in June 2020. All teams that registered for the Agricultural Issues Forum as well as all teams that qualified by winning their district events in Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter meetings were included in the random draws for interviews. Interviews were held regardless of the team competing in the virtual events.

Data Collection

In accordance with IRB approval and prior to the Virtual LDEs, each teacher with an Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter meetings team competing was contacted via email with a participant recruitment letter to explain the purpose of the research and seek consent to interview them about their team. Advisors were notified first by email and then by phone with the notice of intent for the interview and to schedule a time for the interview. The Agricultural Issues Forum took place on Tuesday June 16, 2020, Parliamentary Procedure took place on Wednesday June 17, 2020, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings took place on June 11, 2020. Interviews took place June 11-23, 2020. Efforts were made to complete the interviews before the event, but some interviews took place after the date of the event. Although all advisors had teams qualify for competition at the state event, some advisors did not have teams compete due to the circumstances of individual school district policies. Four teams competed in the Agricultural Issues Forum, five teams competed in Parliamentary Procedure, and five teams competed in Conduct of Chapter Meetings. Four advisors were interviewed from the Agricultural Issues Forum, two from one chapter. The one advisor not interviewed is one of the researchers for this study. Three of the four advisors from Parliamentary Procedure had teams compete. One of the four advisors from Conduct of Chapter Meetings had a team that competed. Interviews took between 17 and 63 minutes, they were audio recorded and field notes were taken during and following the interview. Each interview was transcribed verbatim.

During each interview, advisors were read a consent statement and verbally responded as to agreeing to participate in the interview. Advisors were asked how long they had taught, how many years they have coached CDE/LDE teams, and how many years they have coached the team in which the interview was about. The teachers were then asked each of the questions in Table 3.2. Follow-up questions were asked regarding how their teams reacted to school closures and delays of holding the LDEs due to COVID-19.

Data Analysis

Interviews were utilized to collect qualitative data which was used to describe the team norms and culture of team-based LDE teams. Following the interviews, the audio recordings were transcribed verbatim. The transcriptions were transformed into singular units of data. We separated or disassembled each interview transcript into distinct statements (Yin, 2011) and printed those statements out on two sets of note cards.

Two researchers read each distinct statement and open-coded or classified them into codes and sub codes in a reassembling process (Creswell, 2002; Yin, 2011). In the meaning making process, we utilized a constant comparative method by open coding each distinct statement followed by axial coding to make meaning of the codes (Yin, 2011). We collaboratively worked to identify emergent themes.

In the meaning making process, these singular units were grouped and analyzed for common themes. Eleven themes emerged from the data. For triangulation, associated quotes with assigned themes were sent back to the interviewees to clarify that the interpretation related to the intention in a process called member checking. Additionally, field notes were also used to aid in credibility and trustworthiness. We practiced reflexivity to examine biases and increase trustworthiness, authenticity, and credibility (Creswell, 2013).

Reflexivity Statement

I am a traditionally trained, Caucasian, male agriculture teacher. I have taught in the classroom for 17 years and have trained students for competition in team-based LDEs for 12 years. I teach at a small school in a three-teacher program. I have prepared teams for the Agricultural Issues Forum for the past nine years, including this year. My philosophy of preparing CDE and LDE teams is that parts of a CDE or LDE can and should be taught in class, but that the preparation time for the competition should be done outside of class time. Also, although intense training of a team is necessary for objective success, a few students in

a class should not be excluded from class so they can prepare for their CDE or LDE. I have prepared both Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams in the past and have had teams compete at the state event in both LDEs, however, my passion is for the Agricultural Issues Forum. I am the district director for my FFA district, and as such have been on the Idaho FFA Board of Directors, have attended the meetings, and voted on motions affecting the timing of the LDEs in this study.

CHAPTER 4 - RESULTS

Findings

The participants of this study were current agricultural education teachers and FFA advisors. Each advisor helped prepare a team-based LDE team for competition at the Idaho State FFA Virtual LDEs held during June 2020. Of the participants, 3 identified as female and 9 as male. Participant experience teaching ranged from 1 to 36 years with an average number of years teaching with an average of 19 years. Participant experience coaching CDEs or LDEs ranged from 4 to 36 years with an average of 21.5 years. Participant experience coaching the specific LDE ranged from 1 to 33 years with an average of 10.3 years. Table 3 includes the advisor identification code as well as demographic information for each advisor.

Table 4.1. Advisor Demographic Information

Advisor Identification Code	Gender	Years Teaching	Years Coaching CDEs/LDEs	Years Coaching Specific LDE
AI1	Female	1	4	1
AI2	Male	36	36	10
AI3	Female	4.5	4.5	3
AI4	Male	32	32	3
PP1	Male	23	23	15
PP2	Male	22	22	19
PP3	Male	33	33	33
PP4	Male	16	16	16
CCM1	Male	20	24	6
CCM2	Male	21	21	13
CCM3	Male	13	13	2
CCM4	Female	7	7	3
Range		1-36	4-36	1-33
Mean		19.042	19.625	10.333

Note. AI stands for Agricultural Issues Forum, PP stands for Parliamentary Procedure, and CCM stands for Conduct of Chapter Meetings.

Question One: How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Agricultural Issues Forum Teams?

When examining the interviews from the advisors of the Agricultural Issues Forum, three themes emerged. These themes included team development as a process, high degree of buy-in, and five elements of cooperation. For the five elements of cooperation, a common subtheme of group processing emerged.

Team Development as a Process

Team development as a process was one theme that arose from all the interviews with advisors of Agricultural Issues teams. The advisor responses indicated multiple phases of the team development process. AI1 said they took a while to get on the same page. It was attributed to all of them "becoming comfortable with the topic." This team spent time establishing a common goal and norms they needed to achieve to accomplish their goal. They used a goal sheet to develop their norms. "I really try not to facilitate that a lot, I just want to know what they think...that's what gets them thinking on the same level."

Conflict was discussed as a part of all the Agricultural Issues teams' development process. AI2 talked about some members that "weren't going to dedicate the time" and how the other members were "really frustrated with that process." AI3 said their conflict was "situational. Most of the frustration was a lack of communication or lack of perceived work." AI2 talked about how long it can take to get everyone on the same page and how that can vary based on the team, "Oh my gosh, twelve months sometimes. Maybe before the national event, and sometimes they start off on the same page."

Advisors also discussed the importance of team members taking on roles and working together. AI4 talked about their students taking on different roles and provided taking on responsibility for the portfolio as an example. "I didn't even send the portfolio in. One of the students sent it in." AI2 provided an example of how his team members worked together stating, "I don't remember a practice with this year's team that was not professional and not well attended." Another stated:

> Beyond the event itself I think that's the biggest limiting factor of ag issues because it really causes the team to develop that team dynamic and to grow and function as a team. The personal responsibility that it takes to function as a team. (AI2)

Overall, the advisors of the Agricultural Issues Forum discussed the process of bringing these team members together and assisting them through the group development process.

High Degree of Buy-In

Another common theme for Agricultural Issues Forum teams was a high degree of buy-in from members. The advisors often discussed buy-in as an event requirement, and that students who are interested in the event want to compete. For example, AI2 shared "we've tried to identify an issue that the members can identify with and commit to... to be honest sometimes it's hard to identify seven kids that want to dedicate 10 to 12 months or whatever its going to be to the process." Another team had a team with diverse backgrounds and agriculture experiences who came "together to passionately educate the public about agriculture" (AI1).

The advisors also describe meeting more often with this event and the importance of students needing to complete their work. AI2 said, "Pre-COVID, we were meeting every morning at six o'clock and practicing till 7:30. We had, starting in January and running through when COVID started in the middle of March, one to two forums a week." AI3 described how their team worked to create roles for team members sharing, "They were really good about figuring out what they needed to do and how they needed to do it and they just got it done."

Five Elements of Cooperation

The five elements of cooperation were described by each team advisor as well. They discussed the importance of all team members knowing they all had to prepare for the event, because one person could not carry the team. Therefore, no one would be successful if the team was not successful. Based on this premise, individuals held themselves and their teammates accountable. On one team, three members decided their "other commitments were more important" (AI2) and were replaced with other members who would commit to the team. Another advisor described how the FFA members gave peer feedback stating:

> The kids go up in front of each other and read what they had at the moment so everybody would give suggestions and ideas and thoughts, and we worked as a group to tweak analyze and critique each other what they were looking for they got. (AI3)

These advisors also discussed focus as contributing factor. AI1 talked about how during practice the team members stayed focused sharing, "They weren't on their phones or

doing other things. The only conversations they were having were about their ag issue." After the school closures due to COVID-19, AI4 said "you guys are right there, you just need a little bit more practice. I've just been totally impressed with the kids and how they've come around." The social skills involved in the elements of cooperation were main components of the interviews as well. One team had two members that were not getting along. Their advisor approached them, together, the team members worked out their issues. AI2 noted that "the older members really took the freshman under their wings and made a home for them."

Group Processing

Results indicated that their teams have a high level of focus on the cooperation element of group processing. In selection of topics, teams come together to identify issues that are important to themselves and their community. AI1 talked about how their team identified an issue they learned about in class and connected it to what they saw in their own community. AI2 shared how everyone on his team had a tie to their issue. He said, "their belief in the importance of it not only for the people on their team, but for their classmates, the other students in the school, the community in general, and the agricultural industry in general." In selecting their issue, AI3 had their students research each topic for 30 minutes, then present what they found for 10 minutes. When they finished, the students worked cooperatively and identified the topics they felt they could find the most information for and against their issue.

Question Two: How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Parliamentary Procedure teams?

When examining the interviews from the advisors of Parliamentary Procedure, three themes emerged. These themes included competition/winning, advisor driven norms and culture, and individual accountability. For the advisor driven norms, a common subtheme of set norms emerged. For the individual accountability theme, a subtheme of emerging leaders developed.

Competition/Winning

The focus on the competition and winning was prevalent throughout all of the interviews and oftentimes the focus of discussion with the advisors of Parliamentary Procedure teams. All advisors discussed how they kept and posted the scores at each practice. For example, PP2 stated "scores are kept on debates and those scores are posted so everyone

knows where they stand." PP4 shared about the competitive nature of the event in the state sharing, "...our contest is very, very tough. That's why if you win state in Idaho your chance of placing at nationals is pretty high because they've been through this very difficult sifting...It's cutthroat competitive in Idaho."

Other advisors discussed how they are upfront with the students with how competitive the event is and how they need to also be competitive and willing to invest as an individual. One advisor told his team:

> This is going to be the hardest event you do in FFA...you have to be 100% by the end, if there's not 100%, then it's not worth it, it's not fair to the other five members if you decide not to participate 100%. (PP1)

> PP3 said, "I put a lot of pressure on them before we even start practice. They've got to be on this level on the test." This had to do with the high focus on winning as the outcome of the competition. PP1 said they had "never placed in the top four in state in Parli, so that was their goal, to place in the top four as freshman." PP2 said, "we let them know it's our job to put a varsity team on the floor. It's not just for experience, we want to compete, we want to do well, we want to give everybody the best experience we can." Overall, advisors shared how this event is very focused on the desire to be competitive at the state-level and successful through winning.

Advisor Driven Norms and Culture

Parliamentary Procedure team advisors shared that they have clear expectations that they establish as the advisor and the advisor typically runs the team. Regarding practice schedule, PP3 said "I guided that process." PP1 said "right at the beginning we talked about practices and being on time to practice and if you can't be on time to let us know the day before." When dealing with conflict one advisor said:

> Typically, I try to get ahead of any potential conflict, keep separation of individuals during practice, if the potential is there or have short practices or not practice.
> Depending on the conflict, I take it more upon me than them. (PP3)

When setting goals one advisor said:

Every year at least one or two of them (say our goal) is we want to win state. Alright, I agree that would be fabulous, how about our first goal be that we want to win districts first. So, our goal is to win districts. (PP4)

Both statements provide examples on how the team advisors discussed the role they serve in as advisors and overseeing the group.

Set Norms

Based on the teams being advisor driven, the Parliamentary Procedure team advisors tended to discuss skipping the forming and storming phases of team development. Rather they have a culture of how Parliamentary Procedure is done and the norms are already set for the team. Of the different LDEs, the advisors for Parliamentary Procedure had the most coaching experience with the fewest years coaching at 15 years. Over that time, advisors have developed their way of doing things, sometimes that is student led with one advisor saying:

I let the chairman...coordinate that practice schedule. We generally determine that the mornings will be better, especially as students get older and find jobs. We generally meet between 7 and 8 o'clock in the morning. The goal is to meet twice a week the 12 weeks prior to the event. (PP2)

Another advisor said:

We established a platform beforehand. At the end of each practice we go around and everybody would say one thing that they did well on and one thing that they need to improve on as a team, and one thing they need to improve as an individual. (PP1)

Many of the advisors say there isn't conflict. PP4 said, "There's not much conflict, I don't know if I've ever really dealt with conflict with any of them." PP1 said, "I don't think they had any." PP2 explained they handle conflict "right on the nose and right now. We're not going to let it fester, we're going to take care of it while its small."

The advisors also discussed the importance of individual work and focus on everyone's personal success. PP3 said of their team, "Most of them are willing to practice anytime from mornings to evenings. When they have something going if they can move it or alter it, even if it was a priority." Talking about practice, PP1 said, "we had a lunch practice twice a week and we had a test practice twice a week on opposite days. Monday's of course are test days, because Monday's are hard to get up on." When talking about individual

preparation PP4 said "I give them past tests and a couple of study books, but it's on their own." PP2 said they expect "one hour (outside practice) per practice, either mirror time or book time." PP3 said of outside practice preparation, "That's definitely one key to success. I try to do anything that isn't group oriented to do on their own, which is basically studying the test, studying the oral questions."

Individual Accountability

In addition, individual accountability is a high priority for these advisors of Parliamentary Procedure teams. Individuals on one team are expected to prepare for individual portions, including the individual exam, of the event on their own. One advisor said:

> That's why I always strive to have alternates. To have competition on the team that drives individual improvement. What you'll often see is somebody come in behind, and with committed, consistent work they will replace somebody who has got stagnant in their efforts. (PP2)

Multiple advisors post test scores, one advisor said they do it "to keep the pressure on the others...showing them their scores and telling them where they ought to be" (PP3). PP2 said of posting scores, it "lends itself to trust between the coach and the teammates and everybody on that team." All of these advisors were sharing different tactics they have for holding individuals accountable and promoting the need for students to do their individual work.

Emerging Leaders

The advisors of these Parliamentary Procedure teams described how leaders emerge that enforce and lead other members from a perspective of already set norms. Often these leaders are individuals who have competed on the team before. When forming their team PP2 said, "our chairman and one other young lady coordinated that (initial meeting) to reach everybody." PP1 had a student do "weekly reminders via text." PP3 said of his current team, "there was a kid that kind of helped organize that (outside practice preparation) a little bit." After the schools shut down, PP3 said, "one of the members decided to get a group together on Instagram and they started to send out test questions to keep them sharp on that portion by quizzing each other." When selecting a chairman PP1 said, "a particular student went above and beyond in managing the chairmanship... It was pretty obvious who our chairman was going to be."

Question 3: How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams?

When examining the interviews from the advisors of Conduct of Chapter Meetings (CCM), three themes emerged. These themes included a focus on the experience, advisor driven norms and culture, and intrinsic motivation. The first theme, a focus on the experience, had a subtheme of focus on building social skills and team development and group processing emerged.

Focus on the Experience

CCM advisors focus more on the enjoyment of the process and wanting members to stick with it and continue to compete year-after-year. One advisor said:

> We just kind of gathered up some kids that we covered in the eighth-grade class and said if anybody likes this, then we're going to do it for competition. We hope in the future that will obviously have more than enough kids to want to do it. (CCM1)

CCM3 commented that this was just their second year doing it, "I was looking for something for the middle school kids to get involved with." Because of their involvement the first year he said, "I've already seen the benefits in the chapter as a whole. Those middle school kids that did it the year before are now active members of the chapter." These advisors were sharing how they use the event as a way to get individuals involved at the 7th and 8th grade level and keep them involved through their high school years.

Focus on Building Social Skills and Team Development

The advisors of CCM teams described the teams as emergent. The teams start out with a low level of skills and develop social skills as they progress. One advisor said:

> In the beginning it's just always try to get to knowing one another. Every time you get young kids together it's always, they think it's always gonna be a fun time which you have to convince them it is after it gets hard. (CCM1)

CCM4 describing how the team began starting stated, "some of the kids knew each other, some didn't." Another teacher said "there are obviously different personalities on the team. A couple of kids were more reserved and there were two kids that were extremely outgoing. It ended up balancing out alright." All these advisors were describing how they use this event as a learning opportunity for students to learn how to work on teams with others and develop communication and social skills.

Group Processing

The advisors of CCM teams work to promote group processing. For example, one advisor shared how they help students learn how to handle conflict. This advisor stated:

> There were a couple of girls who had issues from the past. Both of them let me know about it and I was like, well now is your time to grow up. You're either going to figure it out or you're not gonna figure it out, because both of you need to be on the team. I do know they had a conversation and they had one of the other people on the team as a mediator and they were able to work things out. (CCM4)

Another advisor had a student from a previous team that helped motivate the others and lead them through the group process. The advisor said:

> She helped motivate the rest of them because she was like, yeah this was fun, this was really neat to do at state. This is what we need to do and if you don't want to embarrass yourself, this is what you would have to do. (CCM3)

When selecting positions for their team CCM1 said, "we open that position up and once that position is decided then everybody else can just choose what they want to." These advisors were all sharing how they assist the students through group processing from the formation of the team, through conflict, and to create roles and take on responsibilities.

Advisor Driven Norms and Culture

The advisors of CCM teams described their teams as more advisor driven than student driven. Advisors set norms, determine assignments, and resolve conflicts. CCM2 said, "it's pretty obvious when they don't know their part. We as advisors will get on them and let them know what the consequences are of not being prepared and letting their teammates down." CCM3 said, "it was me that said I know you want to do this, so when we practice, you're going to want to do this, and this is what we're going to have to do." In talking about responsibilities CCM1 said, "When it comes to the officers, we don't always think the best kid needs to be the president, but they have to be the best person to run the meeting." In talking about preparation one advisor said,

> We have the things available online, tests and stuff. We basically put markers out there. We want everybody to get an 80%, then we're going to bump it to 90%, when everybody gets a 90%, we're going to have little competitions within the team on the test. (CCM1)

In dealing with conflict CCM4 said, "I always try to make that a place where the students can experiment with discussing and talking with each other, see what works and what doesn't and then giving feedback." These advisors were all discussing the norms that they set, but that were focused on student development.

Intrinsic Motivation

The advisors of CCM teams described their students as having intrinsic motivation. One advisor talked about what made his team special by sharing:

> Their willingness to continue. I had a chapter (parliamentary procedure) team made up of juniors and when they went to an online format, they just kind of checked out. Whereas the younger group of eighth graders just wanted to maintain contact with one another and they wanted that chance of success, so they stuck with it. (CCM1)

CCM2 said of his team, "they were smart, and they were hungry, and a lot of them had older brothers and sisters in our program go to nationals. So, they were hungry to get there themselves." CCM3 said of his team's demonstration of dedication, "Showing up to practice, and then being prepared and learning the motions, having constant improvement. A lot of things we didn't have to go over and over." These advisors were stating how their students wanted to be successful and worked hard for it.

Question 4: Are there differences in the team norms and culture of teams based on LDE?

When examining the interviews from the advisors of all three LDEs, a few differences and similarities emerged. There were differences based on the LDE on whether the advisors tended to drive the culture and norms of the team or the students were more likely to lead the process. Several similarities in cultural themes existed including adaptability, cooperation, dedication, focus, and resilience emerged.

Advisor versus Student Driven

The advisors of the Parliamentary Procedure and CCM described more advisor driven behaviors. While the advisors of the Agricultural Issues Forum tended to describe teams that were more student driven. CCM2 said, "we don't see as much (conflict) as you might think and maybe not as much as other programs or chapters because they (the team) know the expectations from our chapter to succeed and they know what we expect them to do." One advisor said of holding his team accountable,

> Typically, they hold each other accountable to some degree but I try to use some techniques to do that such as when an individual does poorly on the practice test, I try to put a little pressure on them to study a little more. (PP3)

These are just a few examples of how the advisors tended to set the norms and drive the culture of the teams.

On teams that had more of a student focus, we saw more of a goal development process, group processing, and positive interdependence. One advisor of an Agricultural Issues team said:

> As I think back on the 10 Ag Issues teams or the conduct of meetings teams we've had, I don't think there's a year that hasn't been something that they haven't had to work through as a group to get to the desired end product. (AI2)

According to AI2, with Agricultural Issues, "Beyond the event itself, I think that's the biggest limiting factor of ag issues. It really causes the team to develop that team dynamic and to grow and function as a team." AI3 said, "I noticed that when they broke up into teams individually, so teams within the overall group, those two or three individuals would work together on that particular area." Although these examples are all from Agricultural Issues advisors.

Some teams from Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings all described student focused processes, but at a lower level. One Conduct of Chapter Meetings advisor said:

> The only real conflict we ever dealt with was just having one or two kids not as committed as a team. That's one of those things that's a learned behavior, some kids deal with it really good, and some kids don't. Once the kids realize they need to come in for the team, they're able to handle that situation a little bit different. (CCM4)

One Parliamentary Procedure advisor said:

> When we had our first practice, we established a goal, what do you want to accomplish this year: Do you want to participate, do you want to participate with the goal of placing? What do you want to do? They discussed it and came up with a goal of placing in the top four at state. (PP1)

The student focus of these teams was discussed, but at a lower prevalence for CCM and Parliamentary Procedure than for the Agricultural Issues Forum.

Shared Cultural Themes

Adaptability

Overall, all three types of team-based LDEs were adaptable. This norm was especially prevalent this year when discussing the impact of changes in the contest due to COVID-19. Some of these teams completely stepped away from the events, other teams forged through and practice via technology, and others reduced the number of practices in exchange for longer practices. One advisor from Parliamentary Procedure said,

> We couldn't have any contact with face-to-face and I wasn't gonna play with Zoom and all that garbage. They've experienced enough heartbreak with the kids at school, sports, and seniors. The state just kept swapping back-and-forth. I just quit communicating with them and said it's over. (PP4)

An advisor for Agricultural Issues said, "the kids coordinated practices especially after COVID via text and Snapchat. The one person that didn't have internet was able to communicate through Snapchat" (AI2). An advisor for Conduct of Chapter Meetings said, "Practice ran basically the same way. It took a little longer than our typical practice. Usually I only had kids around 45 minutes. When we were all in person it took like an hour on Zoom. (CCM4)"

When COVID-19 closed schools across the state, Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams adapted and figured out a way to make things work. CCM1 said, "This year they were definitely put in a position where their resiliency and their grit was challenged. Sticking together and making it to the end has proved that they've got that stuff." A different team went from practicing twice a week to once a week during the school shutdown. CCM4 said, "It took a little longer than our typical practice. Usually only had kids around for 45 minutes. It took an hour on Zoom." Another team had a member that was sick for two weeks, the students "found an alternate, somebody to help them practice." When the student returned "they all worked together to help them get caught up" (CCM3). These advisors were all describing how their teams adapted to move forward in light of any situation including COVID-19.

Cooperation

The way cooperation was discussed varied across the board. Some teams focused on the element of group processing. AI1 said, "we did our weekly check on that goal sheet. We met this many times in the week as a team, how do we feel about this objective? How are we doing with our ultimate goal?" Another team had to replace their chairman; the team came together to decide on who to bring on, "Everybody except one person have the same name" (PP2). The team was on the same page, understanding who they wanted to take the position. AI2, describing how his team made decisions on roles, said, "nobody really wanted to be on the con side, but they eventually sorted themselves out."

Other teams focused on the element of individual accountability, which was heavily discussed with advisors of Parliamentary Procedure teams. PP3 "put a lot of pressure on them before (they) even start practice. They have to be on this level on the test course." AI4 described how their team demonstrated dedication to the event by "simply (doing) their homework, and (being) pretty upfront about it if they didn't."

Dedication

Team-based LDE teams do not qualify for state by just showing up, but rather the team advisors all described the dedication it takes for individuals and teams to be successful. Often these teams met regularly, several times a week, over several months to even a year for some teams. One Parliamentary Procedure team practiced four days a week, twice in the morning and twice during lunch. PP1 said, "you have to have 100% by the end, if there's not 100%, then it's not worth it." CCM2 said of his team, "they didn't miss practices and they met on a regular basis." AI3 said, "that was the first time I've seen an Ag Issues group that were like, no, we're choosing to do this. They themselves created what they expected of each other." All of these advisors were discussing the importance of continual practice and prioritization from successful teams.

Focus

The advisors of team-based LDE teams described their students as focused. One Agricultural Issues team advisor reflected "Every time we met, there was some sort of progress made either in the portfolio or on the knowledge of our topic" (AI1). After coming back from the school closures, one advisor noted:

> I think that the plus for us taking the time off is it let the kids relax and unwind. They
> got away from it and now coming back into focus on it has put a lot of energy back
> into it. Now they're getting after it. (AI4)

CCM1 said, "Sticking together and making it to the end has proved that they've got that stuff." CCM3 said, "you're not here to goof around. We only had 25 minutes a day to do it." One team didn't have conflict and their advisor attributed this to the need to stay focused, stating, "Typically the more they have a goal to get to, the more they know that conflict is not an option if they want to succeed" (CCM2). These advisors were describing how their students stayed focus and the importance of focus for the students to be prepared for their respective competition.

Resilience

The advisors of teams that competed at the Idaho Virtual State LDEs described them as resilient. This theme may be more based on the changes due to COVID-19 but was still readily discussed. On the week of the event one team came together for the first time in months. When asked if they would compete their advisor said, "Yes, we're going (to), we met this week; our first live practice is tomorrow (PP1)." CCM1 said that what makes his team special is "their willingness to continue." AI4 noted, "They really did work together and obviously with the COVID, had to be super flexible. There were quite a few times where they figured out solutions to problems that I didn't even know they had." These advisors were sharing how their team members had to be resilient to compete. Advisors of teams that did not compete at the Idaho Virtual State LDEs did not share about their team's resiliency or describe their teams as resilient.

CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research is to identify norms and culture of teams competing in team-based LDEs. By identifying those norms, FFA advisors will be able to better instruct their students in developing their own teams, creating a culture throughout the Idaho FFA Association of improved teamwork skills. This chapter includes a discussion of major findings as related to norms and culture of three team-based LDEs, (1) Agricultural Issues Forum, (2) Parliamentary Procedure, and (3) Conduct of Chapter Meetings. Also included is a discussion of the differences in the norms and culture demonstrated by the three types of LDEs. Also included is a discussion on connections to this study and team development theories and soft skill development.

This chapter contains discussion and recommendations for practice for FFA advisors as they help students develop teamwork skills. In addition, this chapter contains answers to the research questions discussed in this chapter. Additionally, we have made recommendations for practice and future research. Research questions addressed include:

1) How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Agricultural Issus Forum teams?

2) How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Parliamentary Procedure teams?

3) How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams?

4) Are there differences in the team norms and culture of teams based on LDE?

The norms and culture demonstrated by Agricultural Issues Forum teams comprise three themes: team development process, high degree of buy-in, and five elements of cooperation. The norms and culture demonstrated by Parliamentary Procedure teams compromised three themes: competition / winning, advisor driven norms and culture, and individual accountability. The norms and culture demonstrated by Conduct of Chapter Meeting teams comprised the three themes: focus on the experience, advisor driven, and intrinsic motivation. A distinct difference emerged between teams that were advisor or student driven in all three events. Additionally, adaptability, cooperation, dedication, focus,

and resilience were all shared components of the culture regardless of which LDE the advisor was discussing.

Discussion

Question 1: How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Agricultural Issues Forum teams?

I propose that Agricultural Issues Forum advisors described their norms and culture through three themes: team development as a process, a high degree of buy-in from the students, and cooperation. Advisors interviewed about their Agricultural Issues Forum teams discussed how they demonstrated all phases of team development (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977). Discussions about forming the team and getting everyone on the same page differed for each team. This is something we expected to find, however, the power of allowing students to go through each phase in the process is notable. Team members that learn how to emotionally engage with each other and learn how to create harmony to accomplish a task are learning soft skills that will benefit them throughout their life (Crawford et al., 2011). Tuckman (1965) stated that problem solving is the key component of performing. Students that can develop this skill will be better prepared for careers (Crawford et al., 2011).

The storming phase is one many Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Meetings teams skip or spend little time in. Storming causes a slowdown or pause in the progress of teams, which is one reason advisors do not want their teams to spend much time here, however, storming is an "emotional response to task demands" (Tuckman, 1965, p. 386). This stage of team development forces individuals to retreat to the familiar and avoid risk (Tuckman, 1965). Allowing yourself to take risks is when progress on a team is made. Learning to take risks in a safe environment removes some of that anxiety they will face in the future when in similar situations. Agricultural Issues teams deal with the storming phase throughout the development and progression of their teams, their adaptability and resilience allow them to have an open exchange with teammates. Teams that overcame emotional challenges became stronger as a team, for example, when two Agricultural Issues teams struggled with members not being as committed as other members, the students took the initiative to solve the problem. They confronted those who lacked the commitment they expected. This resulted in their team being able to move forward with all members being fully committed to the team.

Cooperation is one of the key pieces of functional teams. The five elements of cooperation are positive interdependence, individual accountability, face-to-face promotive interaction, social skills, and group processing (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Although each LDE demonstrated all five elements of cooperation, all four advisors from Agricultural Issues discussed these elements more uniformly across the board. Especially poignant was positive interdependence. "Extraordinary achievement comes from a cooperative group, not from the individualistic or competitive efforts of an isolated individual" (Johnson & Johnson, 1999, p. 67). Agricultural Issues teams knew they could only go as far as the weakest member of their teams. They developed a greater sense of team, or positive interdependence, they knew they could only go as far as the team. (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). The theme of positive interdependence was demonstrated in the Agricultural Issues forums when advisors talked about how their team was

Eager to help each other because they wanted to win, and you can find six or seven kids that want to do it, but to find six or seven kids that want to do it and are actually dedicated to doing what it takes to make the team be successful, that's a different thing entirely. I've had teams fortunately, that we've been able to do that continually, but it's not always an easy process. (AI2)

The preparation for an event like Agricultural Issues takes months. One advisor starts 10 to 12 months before the state event. If the team goes to nationals, they will be preparing for 15 to 16 months. High buy-in by team members was a common theme among Agricultural Issues teams. Teams must make a minimum of five presentations to community groups. It is one thing to present in front of a panel of judges, but when you present in front of people that are affected by the issue on a daily basis, make or enforce laws, or professionals in their area it is a completely different thing. Team members must present pros and cons of the issue, even if they are personally against the issue like one advisor said of his team. Every member of their team had a personal tie to the issue. They wanted to present the issue because of its importance in their community.

Advisors can cultivate buy-in from team members by providing an environment where members can feel safe in communicating with their team and advisor. That buy-in leads to team success (Lencioni, 2002). That culture of safety in communication is demonstrated by Agricultural Issues teams. The nature of the event leads to this culture as both sides of an

issue must be presented. When students can understand both sides of an issue, they can communicate it much easier. They feel more comfortable and confident in what they have to say. This starts early in practices as the teams decide on the scenarios they will present.

Teachers train their teams for the Agricultural Issues Forum by encouraging input from team members about team development. Selection of an issue and scenario are driven by students. Team members are expected to research and write about their issue from multiple perspectives. Advisors allow students to experience productive conflict and experience success in bringing harmony to the team through cooperation and collaboration. In some cases, the advisors set up community forums, in other situations the students are expected to set up forums. The amount of student driven norms develops buy-in from students as they prepare for their event.

Question 2: How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Parliamentary Procedure teams?

We propose that Parliamentary Procedure advisors described the norms and culture through three themes: competition/winning, advisor driven norms and culture, and individual accountability. It was expected that competition was a focus of Parliamentary Procedure teams before our study. Through interviewing, our expectations were confirmed. Advisors view Parliamentary Procedure is a very competitive event in Idaho. High prestige is given to the teams that win, so they want to win. This objective success is a focus of both students and advisors. One team that had never placed in the top four at state was working to do just that. When COVID-19 shut down schools and practices stopped, one team began sending questions to each other to stay sharp. Winning was important to both the students and the advisors. Also evident was the set norms that each team utilized as they prepared their teams. Advisors drive the bus with Parliamentary Procedure. Prescribed team forming meetings, practices, responsibilities outside practice, and competition within the teams are evident from the interviews. Storming phases are cut short or non-existent as advisors keep practices focused. Members of every team are expected to prepare for tests and quizzes on their own. Test scores are posted, and on some teams, alternates can replace members if test scores are too low.

These findings indicated that the focus on winning and competition may be taking away from the team development process and therefore students' ability to walk away with

some soft skills. Positive outputs like increased organizational citizenship behaviors, increased commitment to the organization, improved satisfaction with the work, reduced absenteeism and tardiness, improved organizational communication, improved social benefits for members, and increased affective reactions towards other team members are all possible when the focus is not solely on task-related outcomes (Franz, 2012). This begs the question, are the norms employed by these teams benefiting teams? Are they really teams, or are they groups? Do they develop the leadership skills intended? We can see how the transferability of skills may be higher for Agricultural Issues teams based on previous literature from that experience.

Teachers train their teams for Parliamentary Procedure from an advisor driven perspective. These teachers have experienced objective success in this LDE and know what the students need to do to achieve success. Advisors work with students to develop a practice schedule. Practices are structured based on what works for the advisor. Some advisors only practice the demonstration during practice time, while others have a test practice, or a mixture of both test and demonstration. Team members are expected to prepare for tests outside of practice. Norms are set prior to formation of the team and adhered to by members of the team throughout the culminating state event.

Question 3: How do Idaho FFA advisors describe the norms and culture of Conduct of Chapter Meeting teams?

We propose that Conduct of Chapter Meetings advisors described the norms and culture through three themes: focus on the experience, advisor driven norms and culture, and intrinsic motivation. Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams are in seventh through ninth grade. All advisors interviewed had teams developed through their classes. Advisors recruited, set practice times, set expectations, and worked to help the students enjoy the experience. The experience was important because it translated into active FFA members later in high school.

As part of the team development process, CCM teams are learning how to effectively group process. Advisors can help their teams in this area by focusing on conflict as part of the process. Allowing students an opportunity to resolve conflict, assess progress on an ongoing basis, and identify issues that inhibit performance promotes problem solving and promotes ownership in the process and product (Scott-Ladd & Chan, 2008). In addition, cooperation can be built through ongoing dialog between members of a team concerning member roles,

processes for managing tasks and relationships, and dealing with potential conflicts (Scott-Ladd & Chan, 2008). We contend these components of team development will lead to transferability after the team adjourns.

One thing we found interesting was the motivation of the younger CCM teams was more intrinsic. They wanted to compete, they wanted to be a part of the team, they wanted to practice. Higher levels of motivation are positively correlated to student performance in all areas of FFA competition (Curry, 2017). Advisors can nurture this intrinsic motivation by challenging their teams to think strategically, come up with creative solutions to problems, persist through difficulties, and learn from their experiences (Larson & Rusk, 2011).

Teachers train their teams for Conduct of Chapter Meetings by recruiting members for the team out of their junior high or ninth grade classes. The students are taught the content prior to the formation of the team, then once the team has been created, they work to fine tune the content into a demonstration of their content. CCM is advisor driven as well, advisors set the norms for how practices are run, how often the teams meet, how they will handle conflict, and how students prepare for the test. Much like Parliamentary Procedure, CCM teams are expected to prepare for the exam outside of practice time. Test and debate scores are posted so members of the team know where they stand in relation to other members of the team. The advisors for CCM recognize that these students will be in their FFA program for years to come. As a result, they try to make the experience positive. For many CCM teams, the competition is about the experience.

Question 4: Are there differences in the team norms and culture of teams based on LDE?

We propose the differences in team norms and culture through three themes: advisor driven norms and culture, student driven norms and culture, and cultural themes. We expected to find that team-based LDE teams experienced all the phases of team development, however, interviews suggested otherwise. Agricultural Issues teams were student driven in terms of norms and culture, they also experienced each of the phases of team development. Youth that have student driven experiences become active agents of their own development (Larson et al., 2004). Both Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings team norms and culture were more advisor driven. Advisor driven experiences have their own advantages, for example they get specially designed learning experiences that teach self-confidence, interpersonal skills, and a sense of responsibility (Larson et al., 2004). Parliamentary

Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings are task-focused, they do have structure that aids in accomplishing their task, however, the level of interdependence is lower than what we see in Agricultural Issues leading us to wonder if they are indeed groups rather than teams (Franz, 2012). For most CCM teams, this is their first LDE experience, they had more of a focus of student development and learning group processing. In Parliamentary Procedure, the storming phase was either skipped or mitigated. Tuckman suggested this may happen on task-focused groups like Parliamentary Procedure teams (Tuckman, 1965). The role of the advisor in setting norms for the team to adhere to seems to have spared the team members from storming. The storming phase is associated with the emotional responses of members of the team to task demands to create harmony (Tuckman, 1965). Teams where members learn how to overcome these responses can create energy through sharing diverse viewpoints and information (Franz, 2012).

The culture of all teams associated with this study indicates they developed adaptability, cooperation, dedication, focus, and resilience. Each characteristic is valuable for team-based LDE teams (Sverdrup et al., 2017). Adaptability is the ability to adjust to new conditions (Driskell et al., 2006); resilience is a sustained adaptive effort that prevails despite challenge (Kent et al., 2014). Because teams are made of individuals with individual circumstances, a team that can adjust and recover when difficulties arise will be able to withstand storming phases.

Every advisor talked about the end goal their team had. Each of these goals were explicitly objective in nature, they were placing in the top four, or winning the state event. Coaches also talked about the subjective goals they had, although not as explicit as the objective goals, the subjective goals were important for some teams. More research should be done to understand the subjective results each team experienced. Teams were hungry, they showed dedication to a task and the focus to concentrate their attention or effort towards accomplishing their task (Lencioni, 2016). Performing teams accomplish tasks, they continually measure their progress towards their goals, thus focus and dedication lead to success (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004).

A culture of cooperation is essential for teams to function, in addition, cooperation is a skill employers expect all employees to have prior to hiring (Murti, 2014). As discussed, the five elements of cooperation appear in each of the teams, with some elements more prominent

than others (Johnson & Johnson 1999). Teaching team members to cooperate to accomplish their goals was an important theme. Some advisors expected their teams to be able to work in a team environment, while others nurtured cooperation skills in their teams.

Recommendations for Practice

Examples of practices currently employed by LDE teams are included to assist in developing teams. Recommendations are grouped into student led teams, adaptability and resilience, dedication and focus, and promotion of the five elements of cooperation. Audiences that may be interested in recommendations for practice include FFA advisors, coaches of other youth activities, and secondary teachers.

Student Led Teams

Student driven norms and culture is best if the goal is to develop soft skills that will translate into careers (Larson et al., 2005). Roles of students and advisors should be clearly established early in the forming phase (Erickson & Dyer, 2004). Roles include the responsibilities everyone will take on during the duration of the event. Students should establish a set of expectations for both team members and the advisor. Allowing students to do so will create buy-in for each member, in addition, advisors may find that students take on some of the responsibilities advisors traditionally have taken upon themselves (Larson et al., 2005). Common goals should also be established early in the formative process (Cox & Bobrowski, 2000). Much like establishing expectations, when students establish a common goal buy-in is much easier to accomplish.

Adaptability and Resilience

Team-based LDE teams should have opportunities to change their norms at any time throughout the process. Early identification of potential problems allows teams to effectively adapt to and change norms before they become sources of conflict (Bradley et al., 2015). When conflict does come, teams that are forced to address the problem professionally will develop the skills they can transfer to careers (Riggio & Saggi, 2015). One thing that the Agricultural Issues Forum does that helps to build resilience is the community forums they are required to do. The forums help teams to identify areas of weakness. Going to community organizations that utilize parliamentary procedure is one thing we believe Parliamentary Procedure and Conduct of Chapter Meetings teams could do to develop problem solving skills. As students demonstrate parliamentary motions for the organizations and are

questioned about the how's and why's of what they did they are able to internalize the content more effectively. Potential community groups include city councils, school boards, county commissioners, planning and zoning boards, fair boards, and community foundations.

Dedication and Focus

To cultivate dedication and focus on a team a norming session should take place as soon as a team comes together. The use of a goal sheet may help students to lead the norming process. The norming process should include identification of group goals, a timeline for preparation to achieve the goals, norms the group is expected to conform to, consequences for not conforming to team norms, and a platform to members to critique individuals and the group (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004; Janicik & Bartel, 2003). Having the norming process allows members to input their opinions, hear concerns from other members, and identify roles each member will take in the team.

Promote the Five Elements of Cooperation

Advisors should promote the five elements of cooperation. Advisors can promote positive interdependence by including everyone in the norming phase (Cox & Bobrowski, 2000). They can reinforce team importance over individual importance. In order to succeed, everyone on the team needs to buy-in and be committed, everyone needs to see their role as well as the others' roles as being essential (Aubé & Rousseau, 2005). When one person falls short, the group falls short.

Social loafing can be limited by promoting individual accountability (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2009). Expectations should be established during the norming process to establish transparency in the process. When students initiate this process the buy-in is greater, advisors should be ready to direct students in establishing norms that the students may not think of.

One advisor interviewed established a platform for critiquing. This platform helps to promote face-to-face promotive interaction. This platform is the summary portion of every practice. Students provide feedback to the group and individuals about the good things they did and the things they need to improve on. Providing a platform for critiques ensures that growth and deep learning will take place (Kristiansen et al., 2019).

Advisors should actively teach social skills to team members. Success as a team depends on the individuals' interpersonal and small group skills. They need to be taught

leadership, decision-making, trust-building, communication, and conflict-management skills with the same purpose as they are taught the content of the event (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).

The critique platform allows teams to measure their progress towards their goals. The more the group knows where they need to go or where they need to be the better, they will be at group processing. Establishing a timeline for success and measuring the progress towards each benchmark will help a team progress much more quickly than informally having an idea of where they want to go. Group processing also allows the team to revisit norms and solve problems that arise in the group process (Tsay & Brady, 2010).

Recommendations for Research

One piece that is missing from this research is the student perspective. It is hard to determine if students felt the same as advisors based on the methodology of the study. Do the students feel like they were cohesive as a team? Did they feel like they all put forth the effort to be successful? Were there members of their team pulling them down? Did anyone step-up and take a leadership role? What were the students' actual experiences? What were the students' thoughts when the COVID-19 pandemic closed schools and changed the format of the LDEs? Advisors have a different perspective than their students and the student perspective should be investigated more.

The student versus advisor driven aspect of this research can be flushed out with additional research. We have made assumptions that student driven norms lead to more team development, but this was not examined in this study. Does a team whose focus on the product (winning), lose out when it comes to the process? Specifically, are the teams that win developing team building skills? Are they developing the skills to emotionally engage with team members to create harmony? Another study could help flush out these questions more effectively.

Limitations of the Study

It is difficult to understand student perspectives when interviewing advisors. Assumptions were made about teams without talking to team members.

Attempts were made to interview all advisors prior to the events, however, not all advisors were interviewed before the events took place. Differences in expectations of performance as compared to the actual performance may have had an impact on the answers to questions.

COVID-19 created obstacles with each team that qualified or prepared for competition at their respective state level LDE. School districts established different policies which created an unequitable situation for all teams. Some of the advisors were able to meet with or communicate with their team members, other advisors were to have no contact with their team members. In addition, technology interfered with the ability of some advisors to connect with some of their students. The Idaho FFA Board of Directors met several times to establish how the events would be held. Changes in dates and formatting created uncertainty in advisors. Moving to a virtual format for each of the events created a new set of trials for each program. Some decided to opt out of the events, while others persevered with the expectation to compete.

Final Conclusions

Agricultural Issues Forum teams had student driven norms and culture. These norms allowed them to fully engage in the phases of team development, had a high degree of buy-in, and demonstrated a diversity in cooperation skills. Parliamentary Procedure teams were more advisor driven, had set norms established by advisors based on years of experience, and their focus was on competition and winning which may have taken away opportunities for complete engagement in team development. Conduct of Chapter Meetings team norms are advisor driven, the focus of the advisors is to engage students in the experience in the hopes to develop engaged FFA members in high school, and student motivation was intrinsic. The main difference in norms between LDEs were whether the norms were student or advisor driven. Where students drove norm creation, greater team development and cooperation skills were demonstrated. Common cultural themes included adaptability and resilience, cooperation, and focus and determination.

Works Cited

Abele, A. E., Hagmaier, T., & Spurk, D. (2016). Does career success make you happy? The mediating role of multiple subjective success evaluations. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 17*(4), 1615-1633. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/s10902-015-9662-4

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1990). *Introduction to Research in Education* (4th ed.). Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Aubé, C., & Rousseau, V. (2005). Team goal commitment and team effectiveness: The role of task interdependence and supportive behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 9*(3), 189-204. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.9.3.189

Axelrod, R. (1986). An evolutionary approach to norms. *The American Political Science Review, 80*(4), 1095-1111. https://doi.org/10.2307/1960858

Ball, A., Bowling, A., & Bird, W. (2016). A case study of learning, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Agriculture Education, 57*(3), 115-128. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2016.03115

Blakely, M., Holschuh, M., Seefeldt, B., Shinn, G., Smith, E., & Vaughn, P. (1993). Perceived value of FFA contests and awards by students and other adult groups. *Proceedings of the National Agricultural Education Research Meeting, 20*, 355-360.

Boardman-Smith, D., & Garton, B. L. (2008). *The perceptions held by FFA members of employability skill development associated with agriculture career development events*

Bolton, A., Edgar, D. W., & Carter, V. (2018). Successful secondary agricultural programs outside the classroom: A view of champions. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 59(2),* 255-274. http//doi.org/10.5032/jae.2018.02255.

Bowling, A. M. (2010). *Frequency of coaching behaviors used by agriculture teachers in relation to the state floriculture career development team rank* [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. University of Missouri.

Bradley, B. H., Anderson, H. J., Baur, J. E., & Klotz, A. C. (2015). When conflict helps: Integrating evidence for beneficial conflict in groups and teams under three perspectives. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 19*(4), 243-272. https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000033

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019). *Employment by major industry sector.* https://www.bls.gov/emp/tables/employment-by-major-industry-sector.htm

Burke, S., Salas, E., & Diaz, D. (2008). The role of team learning in facilitating team adaptation within complex environments: Tools and strategies. In V. I. Sessa & M. London (Eds.). *Group learning* (pp. 217-241). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carron, A. V., Colman, M. M., Wheeler, J., & Stevens, B. (2002). Cohesion and performance in sport: A meta analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 24*, 168-188. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.24.2.168

Cialdini, R. B. (2009). *Influence: Science and practice* (5th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

Covey, S. M. R. (2006). *The speed of trust: The one thing that changes everything*. Free Press.

Cox, P. L., & Bobrowski, P. E. (2000). The team charter assignment: Improving the effectiveness of classroom teams. *Institute of Applied and Behavioral Management, 1*(2), 93-108. https://jbam.scholasticahq.com/article/789-the-team-charter-assignment-improving-the-effectiveness-of-classroom-teams

Crawford, P., Lang, S., Fink, W., Dalton, R., & Fielitz, L. (2011). *Comparative analysis of soft skills: What is important for new graduates?* https://www.aplu.org/members/commissions/food-environment-and-renewable-resources/CFERR_Library/comparative-analysis-of-soft-skills-what-is-important-for-new-graduates/file

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating Quantitative and qualitative research.* Prentice Hall.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage Publications.

Cross, R., & Gray, P. (2013). Where has the time gone? Addressing collaboration in a networked economy. *California Management Review, 51*(1), 50-66. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2013.56.1.50

Curry, K. W., Jr. (2017). *Motivations of FFA career development event competitors and coaches* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. North Carolina State University.

Driskell, J. E., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & O'shea, P. G. (2006). What makes a good team player? Personality and team effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 10*(4), 249-271. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.10.4.249

Dyer, W. G., Dyer, J. H., & Dyer, W. G. (2013). *Team building: Proven strategies for improving team performance* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350-383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Ericksen, J., & Dyer, L. (2004). Right from the start: Exploring the effects of early team events on subsequent project team development and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 49*(3), 438-471. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4131442

Falk, J. M., Masser, D. T., Palmer, H., & Foster, D. D. (2014). Describing the relationship between coaching behaviors and student performance at the National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Career Development Event. *Proceedings of the 2014 American Association for Agricultural Education Annual Research Conference*. http://www.aaaeonline.org/Resources/Documents/National/Research%20Proceedings,%20National2014.pdf

Feldman, D. (1984). The development and enforcement of group norms. *Academy of Management, 9*(1), 47-53. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277934

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7*(2), 117-140. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202

Fisher, B. A. (1970). Decision emergence: Phases in group decision-making. *Speech Monographs, 37*(1), 53-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637757009375649

Flavin, B. (2018, March 7). *The importance of teamwork skills in work and school*. https://www.rasmussen.edu/student-experience/college-life/importance-of-teamwork-skills-in-work-and-school/

Forsyth, D. R. (2006). *Group dynamics* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Franz, T. M. (2012). *Group dynamics and team interventions: Understanding and improving team performance*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Freeman, S. M. (2017). *An investigation of soft skill development of California agricultural education students participating in an FFA career development event* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Texas Tech University/Texas A&M.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gersick, C. J. (1991). Revolutionary Change Theories: A Multilevel Exploration of the Punctuated Equilibrium Paradigm. *The Academy of Management Review, 16*(1), 10-36. https://doi.org/10.2307/258605

Guglielmi, R. S., & Tatrow, K. (1998). Occupational stress, burnout, and health in teachers: A Methodological and theoretical analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(1), 61-99. http://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068001061

Hackman, J. R. (1992). *Group influences on individuals in organizations.* Yale University.

Heslin, P. A. (2003). Self- and other-referent criteria of career success. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *11*(3), 262–286. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072703254500

Hillison, J. (1987). The Smith–Hughes Act at 70. *Agricultural Education Magazine 59*(8), 4.

Hurt, A.C., & Trombley, S.M. (2007). *The punctuated-Tuckman: Towards a new group development model.* https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED504567.pdf

Idaho FFA Association. (2019). *FFA facts and history*. https://www.idahoffa.org/ffa-facts-history

Idaho State Department of Education. (n.d.). *ISAT comprehensive assessment system*. https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/isat-cas/

Isaac, M. L. (2012, March). "I hate group work!" Social loafers, indignant peers, and the drama of the classroom. *The English Journal, 101*(4), 83-89. https://www.jstor.org/stable/31314378

Janicik, G. A., & Bartel, C. A. (2003). Talking about time: Effects of temporal planning and time awareness norms on group coordination and performance. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 7*(2), 122-134. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.7.2.122

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). Making cooperative learning work. *Theory into Practice, 38*(2), 67-73. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1477225

Jones, M. C., & Edwards, M. C. (2019). Competition as an instructional approach in school-based agricultural education (SBAE): A historical review. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 60*(1), 109-128. http://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2019.01109

Kent, M. W., Davis, M. C., & Reich, J. W. (2014). *The resilience handbook: Approaches to stress and trauma*. Routledge.

Kristiansen, S. D., Burner, T., Johnsen, B. H., & Yates, G. (2019). Face-to-face promotive interaction leading to successful cooperative learning: A review study. *Cogent Education, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2019.1674067

Larson, C. E., & LaFasto, F. M. (1989). *Teamwork: What must go right, what can go wrong*. Sage Publications.

Larson, R. W., & Rusk, N. (2011). Intrinsic motivation and positive development. *Positive Youth Development Advances in Child Development and Behavior, 41*, 89-130. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-386492-5.00005-1

Larson, R., Walker, K., & Pearce, N. (2004). A comparison of youth-driven and adult-driven youth programs: Balancing inputs from youth and adults. *Journal of Community Psychology, 33*(1), 57-74. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20035

Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team*. Jossey-Bass.

Lencioni, P. (2016). *The ideal team player*. Jossey-Bass.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science, social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations, 1*(2), 143-153. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100201

Luecke, R. (2004). *Creating teams with an edge: The complete skill set to build powerful and influential teams*. Harvard Business School Press.

Lundry, J., Ramsey, J. W., Edwards, M. C., & Robinson, J. S. (2015). Benefits of career development events as perceived by school-based agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *56*(1), 43–57. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2015.01043

McClure, B. A. (2005). *Putting a new spin on groups: The science of chaos* (2nd ed.). Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611932

McGrath, J. (1991). Time, interaction, and performance (TIP): A theory of groups. *Small Group Research, 22*(2), 147-174. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496491222001

Moore, G. E. & Borne, C. (1985). The secondary vocational agriculture curriculum from 1890-1980. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 27(3),* 8-19.

Moore, G.E. (1987). The status of agricultural education prior to the Smith–Hughes Act. *Agricultural Education Magazine 59*(8), 4.

Morgan, B. B., Salas, E., & Glickman A. (1993). An analysis of team evolution and maturation. *The Journal of General Psychology, 120*(3), 277-291. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.1993.9711148

Muchinsky, P. M., & Howes, S. S. (2009). *Psychology applied to work* (9th ed.). Hypergraphic Press.

Mullen, B., & Cooper, C. (1994). The relationship between group cohesiveness and performance: An integration. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*(2), 210-227.

Murnane, R. J., & Papay, J. P. (2010). Teachers' views on no child left behind: Support for the principles, concerns about the practices. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 24*(3), 151-166. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20799160

Murti, A. B. (2014). Why soft skills matter. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills, 8*(3), 32-36.

National FFA Organization. (n.d.). *Agricultural issues forum*. https://www.ffa.org/participate/cde-lde/agricultural-issues-forum/

National FFA Organization. (n.d.). *Career and leadership development events*. https://www.ffa.org/participate/cde-lde/

National FFA Organization. (n.d.). *Conduct of chapter meetings*. https://www.ffa.org/participate/ldes/conduct-of-chapter-meeting/

National FFA Organization. (n.d.). *FFA vision, mission and motto*. https://www.ffa.org/about/who-we-are/mission-motto/

National FFA Organization. (n.d.). *Parliamentary procedure*. https://www.ffa.org/participate/ldes/parliamentary-procedure/

National Research Council. (1988). *Understanding agriculture: New directions for education.* National Academy Press.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Collins, K. M., & Jiao, Q. G. (2009). Performance of cooperative learning groups in a postgraduate education research methodology course. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 10*(3), 265-277. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787409343190

Pietrykowski, B. (2017). Revaluing low-wage work: Service-sector kills and the fight for 15. *Review of Radical Political Economics, 49*(1), 5-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613416666543

Phipps, L.J., Osborne, E.W., Dyer J. E. and Ball, A. (2008). *Handbook on agricultural education in public schools* (6th ed.). Thomson Delmar.

Poole, M. S. (1981). Decision development in small groups I: A comparison of two models. *Communications Monographs, 48*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758109376044

Poole, M. S. (1983). Decision development in small groups II: A study of multiple sequences in decision making. *Communication Monographs, 50*(3), 206-232. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758309390165

Reese, S. (2003). Career and technical student organizations: Building our future. *Techniques: Connecting Education and Careers, 78*(2), 18-23, 50-52.

Riggio, R. E., & Saggi, K. (2015). Incorporating "soft skills" into the collaborative problem-solving equation. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 8*(2), 281-284. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.34

Rubenstein, E. D., Conner, N. W., Hurst, S. D., Thoron, A. C. (2016). A philosophical examination of school-based agricultural education and NBC's education nation. *NACTA Journal, 60*(3), 263-271.

Russell, C. R., Robinson, J. S., & Kelsey, K. D. (2009). Motivating agriculture students to participate in career development events. *Career and Technical Education Research, 34*(2), 103-118.

Schaubroeck, J., Carmeli, A., Bhatia, S., & Paz, E. (2016). Enabling team learning when members are prone to contentious communication: The role of team leader coaching. *Human Relations*, *69*(8) 1709-1727. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715622673

Scott-Ladd, B., & Chan, C. C. (2008). Using action research to teach students to manage team learning and improve teamwork satisfaction. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 9*(3), 231-248. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787408095848

Sherif, M., White, B. J., & Harvey, O. J. (1955). Status in experimentally produced groups. *The University of Chicago Press Journals, 60*(4), 370-379. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2772030

Soule, H. & Warrick, T. (2015). Defining 21st century readiness for all students: What we know and how to get there. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts,* 9(2), 178-186. https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000017

Smith, A. R., & Smalley, S. (2018). Job stress, burnout, and professional development needs of mid-career agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 59*(2), 305-320. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2018.02305

Stewart, C., Wall, A., & Marciniec, S. (2016). Mixed signals: Do college graduates have the soft skills that employers want? *Competition Forum. 14,* 276-281.

Sverdrup, T. E., Schei, V., & Tjolsen, O. A. (2017). Expecting the unexpected: Using team charters to handle disruptions and facilitate team performance. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 21*(1), 53-59. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000059

Talbert, B. A., & Balschweid, M. A. (2006). Career aspirations of selected FFA members. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 47*(2), 67-80. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2006.02067

Talbert, B. A., Vaughn, R. C., & Croom, D. B. (2005). *Foundations of agricultural education.* Professional Educators Publications.

Tauber, S., & Sassenberg, K. (2012). The impact of identification on adherence to group norms in team sports: Who is going the extra mile? *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 16*(4), 231-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028377

Torres, R. M., Lawver, R. G., & Lambert M. D. (2009). Job-related stress among secondary agricultural teachers: A comparison study. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 50*(3), 100-111. http://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2009.03100

Tosti, D. T. (2007). Aligning the culture and strategy for success. *Performance Improvement, 46*(1), 21-25. https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.035

Tsay, M., & Brady, M. (2010). A case study of cooperative learning and communication pedagogy: Does working in teams make a difference? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(2), 78-89.

Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 63*(6), 384-399.

Tuckman, B. W., & Jensen, M. A. (1977). Stages of small-group development revisited. *Groups and Organization Management, 2*(4), 419-427.

Tyler, T. R., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research.* SAGE Publications.

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Every student succeeds act (ESSA)*.
https://www.ed.gov/essa

Van Rooy, D., Wood, I., & Tran, E. (2017). Modeling the emergence of shared attitudes from group dynamics using an agent-based model of social comparison theory. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science, 67*(7), 188-204.

Varney, G. H. (1989). *Building productive teams an action guide and resource book*. Jossey-Bass.

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1950). An outline of general system theory. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science,* 1, 136-165.

Wheelan, S. A. (2009). Group size, group development, and group productivity. *Small Group Research, 40*(2), 247-262. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496408328703

Wooden, J., & Carty, J. (2005). *Coach Wooden's pyramid of success.* Regal Books.

Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish.* The Guildford Press.