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

Thomas A. Jacobsen[1]
Sarah A. Bush[2]
James Conners[3]
D. Adam Cletzer[4]

Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative study was to identify how advisors describe the norms and culture of teams who qualified for competition in team-based Leadership Development Events (LDEs) at the 2020 Idaho State Virtual LDEs. We extrapolated differences in team norms and culture from the Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings (CCM) from interviews with the advisors of the teams. We conducted and open-coded interviews. From the interview data, we determined teams whose norms were student driven (i.e., Agricultural Issues Forum teams) had more of a team development experience, had more buy-in, and experienced more elements of cooperation. Teams with advisor-driven norms (i.e., Parliamentary Procedure and CCM teams) were more focused on the competition and winning; in addition, individual accountability was a common theme. Accountability, cooperation, dedication, focus, and resilience emerged as themes in team culture. This information can be used to assist FFA chapter advisors and other youth coaches in preparing their students and structuring team development plans to assist students in developing team-related employability skills.

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 United States 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 or employability skills like critical thinking, problem solving, and related abstract cognitive skills. Employability skills are non-technical, applied skills that employees are expected to possess and are oftentimes difficult to measure (Stewart et al., 2016). Individuals who 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 prepared to enter the workforce.

[1] Thomas A. Jacobsen is an Extension Educator/Assistant Professor in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at the University of Idaho, 19 W. 1st N., St. Anthony, ID 83445, tjacobsen@uidaho.edu. ORCID 0000-0001-6807-1671

[2] Sarah A. Bush is an Assistant Professor of Agricultural Leadership in the Department of Agricultural Education and Communication at the University of Florida, PO Box 112060, Gainesville, FL, 32611, sab5271@ufl.edu. ORCID 0000-0002-6706-7037

[3] James Connors is the Associate Dean and Director of Academic Programs and Professor in the College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences at South Dakota State University, Box 2207, Brookins, SD 57007, James.Connors@sdstate.edu. ORCID 0000-0002-4603-6725

[4] D. Adam Cletzer is a Professor of Practice of Agricultural Communications and Leadership in the College of Agriculture at Auburn University, 101A Comer Hall, Auburn, AL 36849, adam.cletzer@auburn.edu. ORCID 0000-0002-6664-8454

In a study assessing employability skill gaps, employers rated understanding one's role and having realistic career expectations, appropriately navigating conflict, and implementing direction and feedback as the largest skill gaps (Crawford & Fink, 2020). While these skill gaps were assessed based on the preparedness of college graduates, it is beneficial for skill development to begin during high school. The three-circle model employed in agricultural education provides a framework for skill development through classroom/laboratory instruction, the National FFA Organization, and supervised agricultural experiences (SAE). The combination of these three elements leads to a unique opportunity for increased skill development.

The mission of the National FFA Organization (FFA) (n.d.) 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" (para 2). This is accomplished by developing employability skills in teamwork, communications, human relations, and social interaction (FFA, n.d.). Through preparation for and participation in Career Development Events (CDEs) and Leadership Development Events (LDEs), students develop a host of employability skills needed for success in careers after high school (Smith & Thapa, 2022). Students who participate in CDEs and LDEs develop time management, social competence, achievement motivation, intellectual flexibility, task leadership, emotional control, active initiative, and self-confidence (Freeman, 2017). These events are designed to challenge students "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., para. 1).

In terms of preparing for a CDE or LDE, the development of team norms relates to the way in which teams prepare for a competition. As a team, one would expect the collaboration and energy the team brings to their work to result in higher success. However, team norms and culture often impact the overall success of achieving greater additive results or synergy (Franz, 2012). Team norms include instructions of typical behavior that is 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 reprimanded 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 develop norms unintentionally and without group consent, and at other times leaders dictate group norms (Feldman, 1984).

While 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 practices we should follow. Culture is aligned with the mission and values of the organization. When groups and teams are results based, poor practices can destroy good processes (Tosti, 2007). While both norms and culture are based around the team members—FFA members—the advisor of the team plays a pivotal role in preparing these students and aiding in their transferable, career-readiness skill development. Therefore, this study explores of advisors describe the team norms and culture of team-based LDE teams. While winning a state contest may be the goal of many advisors, the skills developed as students learn to work with their team will last their entire lives and should be a valued focus (Currie, 2019). Focus on teaching these skills can help students develop employability skills and lead to success in team-based LDEs.

Literature Review

Success can be defined in two ways, objectively and subjectively. Objective success is measurable, results based, and verifiable by a third party (Abele et al., 2016). Subjective success is less measurable, process based, and self-reported (Heslin, 2003). In FFA, when students win a state contest, we would consider that an objective success. Objective success or achievement is something most FFA members strive for but only a few get to experience. Subjective success is possible for every student that competes in a CDE or LDE. Subjective success for an individual might be getting through their speech without any awkward pauses or for a team may include solving a difficult problem together. No awards are given out to these individuals, but they are still able to feel a sense of accomplishment and develop employability skills (Lundry et al., 2015; Smalley & Sands, 2018; Smith & Thapa, 2022).

CDEs and LDEs are activities 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 revealed that some of the most important skills developed through CDEs and LDEs are teamwork and responsibility (Blakely et al., 1993; Lundry et al., 2015; Scott, 2023). Freeman (2017) indicated FFA members who participated in the Opening and Closing Ceremonies contest demonstrated significant improvement in employability skills, such as time management, social competence, intellectual flexibility, emotional control, active initiative, and self-confidence. Teachers and students agree that participating in CDEs helps students develop employability skills (Boardman-Smith, 2008; Lundry et al., 2015). However, each CDE and LDE has different characteristics, rules, and outcomes. Many CDEs and LDEs are group events. However, the three LDEs that we determined to be team based were the Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and Conduct of Chapter Meetings (CCM). These LDEs require students to work together to accomplish a task. Each of these LDEs provides structure to help the team accomplish their task and each has a high level of interdependence. As such, they would be considered a team rather than a group (Franz, 2012).

Parliamentary procedure was added as a competition in 1992 and the agricultural issues forum in 1997 in response to the National Research Council's (NRC) 1988 report that encouraged a focus on increasing leadership skills and competencies for employment (Jones & Edwards, 2019). CCM was subsequently added in 2017 (Jones & Edwards, 2019). In the Agricultural Issues Forum, teams research the pros and cons of an agricultural issue and present their findings to a panel of judges (National FFA Organization, n.d.). These teams must research a topic of concern in the agricultural community, prepare a portfolio, and present it at community forums. The teams in the Agricultural Issues Forum have between three and seven members and the amount of creativity is up to the team. Because of the nature of the LDE, a collaborative approach to team building is essential (National FFA Organization, n.d.). Parliamentary Procedure and CCM teach the practical use of parliamentary law in civic meetings. While CCM 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 seventh to ninth grade can participate in CCM. 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 CCM teams include seven members. Teamwork is the basis for competition in both events, students must work

with each other to complete the team presentation. If a student fails to debate, make an assigned motion, or use a motion incorrectly, the entire team's score is impacted.

FFA chapter advisors or other coaches who help prepare an LDE team are essential to fostering team development and motivation (Bowling, 2010; Jacox, 2019). 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 and motivation for directing the team and assisting the team in developing essential team-based skills varies by the advisor.

In reviewing research related to these events, no research has specifically been done on the Agricultural Issues Forum. However, research has been conducted in relation to noncognitive skills (i.e., grit, optimism, and self-efficacy) for participants in the agricultural issues forum and revealed that these participants fall in the middle for noncognitive skills when related to other LDEs and CDEs (Smith & Thapa, 2022). Additionally, research on the 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., 2016b; Russell et al., 2009). Students and advisors who competed in the California Opening and Closing Ceremony contest gained more soft skills than those who did not participate (Freeman, 2017). More research is needed to further understand this development and how the level of development may have been impacted by their experience in and preparation for the event.

Additionally, very little research has been conducted on how advisors prepare their teams and best practices for building employability skills through team-based LDE events. However, several studies have been conducted on the coaching behaviors of FFA advisors of CDE and LDE participants and teams (Bird et al., 2013; Bowling & Torres, 2010; Falk et al., 2014; Voigt et al. 2013). A study by Ball et al. (2016a) revealed that objectively successful teachers of CDE teams use extrinsic and intrinsic motivation strategies based on individual student needs and coaching and learning strategies to increase competitive drive and content knowledge. In a later study, it was indicated that these strategies also support students' psychological needs and increased motivation (Bowling & Ball, 2020). Further, Nowak et al. (2019) indicated that transformational leadership––developing relationships that raise the level of motivation and morale of both leader and follower—is the most common style of FFA advisors in successful programs. While these studies provide some insight into coaching behaviors and strategies for competition, they do not explore how to prepare teams with a high level of interdependence. Therefore, most of these teams are not truly teams, but rather groups working towards a shared goal (Franz, 2012).

Theoretical Foundation

Team development has been a major area of study for researchers over several decades (e.g., 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. In his seminal work, 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. 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, characterized by intragroup conflict, follows as individuals express emotional responses to task demands. Development of group cohesion (i.e., the norming stage) follows as individuals establish behaviors that allow 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 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 backward, and, sometimes, never getting to the performing stage. Developing a system in which teams thrive even 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). This includes creating team norms and a shared team culture through the developmental process.

Team Norms

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) (Festinger, 1954). Research by Sherif et al. (1955) and Festinger (1954) demonstrate how small groups tend to develop shared norms. Festinger (1954) developed SCT to show 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 individual's behavior but also for the processes of formation and changing of membership (Festinger, 1954). Another axiom of Festinger (1954) is that when a communicated position falls within an individual's latitude of acceptance, they will strive to reduce the social difference with comparison. This assimilation allows a group to move forward with tasks and goals effectively.

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 shortcut the process by conscious group decisions (Hackman, 1992).

Team Culture

Organizational culture is possibly the most critical factor determining an organization's capacity, effectiveness, and longevity—and collaboration is key (Woodbury, 2006). Reaching a shared vision can only be accomplished with language and a process that promotes the inclusion and connection of everyone concerned (Woodbury, 2006). 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 (Franz, 2012).

Lencioni's (2002) *Five Dysfunctions of a Team* identifies five essential factors of a team, which are: (1) trust, (2) dealing with conflict, (3) commitment, (4) accountability, and (5) attention to results. When team members trust each other, they can stay focused on the problems they are solving (Larson & LaFasto, 1989). Conflict arises in 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 leads to functionality (Dyer et al., 2013; Varney, 1989). Larson and LaFasto (1989) revealed that low-functioning teams have members who place their own interests above the team. Members of functional teams hold themselves and their teammates accountable (Covey, 2006). Team members understand that each member has responsibilities and "slackers or poor performers won't just slip by" (Covey, 2006, p. 203). A common goal that each person can articulate is essential for a functional team (Luecke, 2004). "Teams should be designed around the results to be achieved" (Larson & LaFasto, 1989, p. 42). When combined, these five functions provide direction for teams that are not achieving the desired results.

According to Johnson and Johnson (1999), the five essential elements of cooperative learning consist of the following: (a) positive interdependence, (b) individual accountability, (c) face-to-face promotive interaction, (d) social skills, and (e) 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 others' efforts to achieve (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Highly cooperative teams have individuals that have social skills including leadership, decision-making, communication, trust-building, and conflict management skills. Many times, these skills must be taught to individuals, and just telling team members to cooperate does not guarantee cooperation (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Group processing occurs when team members discuss their progress toward 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 and the role of the FFA advisor or coach in supporting the team. Team members must recognize their interdependence, and 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 toward goals, to identify, define, and solve problems they have effectively.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to identify how advisors view and form team norms and the culture of teams competing in team-based LDEs. Based on differences in event focus, outcomes, and participants in each LDE, we aimed to explore how advisors view team norms and culture for each LDE (i.e., Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and CCM) prior to comparing differences and similarities. By

identifying current and desired team norms, and providing structure for development, FFA chapter advisors can aid students in the team development process.

Research Questions (RQ):

RQ 1: How do Idaho FFA chapter advisors describe the norms and culture of their Agricultural Issues Forum teams?
RQ 2: How do Idaho FFA chapter advisors describe the norms and culture of their Parliamentary Procedure teams?
RQ 3: How do Idaho FFA chapter advisors describe the norms and culture of their CCM teams?
RQ 4: Are there differences in the team norms and culture of teams based on LDE?

Methods

We designed a qualitative descriptive case study (Yin, 2014) with semi-structured phone interviews with Idaho FFA chapter advisors to explore team development in three team-based LDEs: Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and CCM. We employed a descriptive framework to "describe a phenomenon (the "case") in its real-world context" (Yin, 2014, p. 238). To describe the 'how' of the case, we used previous research and theory (Yin, 2014) to create a predetermined, 18-question protocol (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Tosti, 2007). We transcribed audio recordings verbatim. We used an open and axial coding process to make meaning and identify emergent themes. We then employed a cross-case synthesis to compare themes from each LDE.

Sample

The target sample was FFA chapter advisors who had teams qualify for competition or competed at the Idaho FFA Virtual LDEs in the Agricultural Issues Forum, Parliamentary Procedure, and CCM in June 2020. We determined these three events to be the only team-based CDE/LDEs in Idaho. We 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 LDE. Every chapter in Idaho may compete in the Agricultural Issues Forum without qualifying at the district level. However, in Parliamentary Procedure and CCM each district may send one qualified team—for a maximum of 10 teams each.

We purposively selected advisors of these top ten teams for Parliamentary Procedure and CCM because they had already demonstrated objective success. We then randomly selected four team advisors who had teams that won at the district level and were invited to compete at the state level for Parliamentary Procedure and CCM. School closures, as a result of COVID-19, occurred across Idaho during the time these events would have normally taken place. As a result, these events were moved to an online format. In the Agricultural Issues Forum, four teams competed, but we excluded one team because a researcher was the advisor for that team. Because of this, we only interviewed three team advisors. However, one team had two advisors who trained the team, and we interviewed both advisors for a total of four interviews. During the analysis phase, we analyzed these interviews as two descriptions of a single team. In the CCM LDE, we contacted four advisors to be interviewed; however, one advisor could not be reached, so we randomly selected another to be interviewed. Of the 10 teams that qualified to compete at the state level, only five teams competed. Only one of the four advisors that we interviewed had a team compete at the state level, the other teams chose not to compete because of the impact of school closures.

In the Parliamentary Procedure LDE, we contacted and interviewed four advisors. Three of the four advisors interviewed had teams compete at the state level, and the other advisor had a team qualify for competition but chose not to compete. Overall, we interviewed 12 advisors, four from each of the three events.

Data Collection and Analysis

We conducted semi-structured interviews using a predetermined protocol that we developed based on previous scholarship (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Tosti, 2007). The questions relating to team norms as described by Johnson and Johnson (1999) included questions such as "how did your team establish a common goal when the team formed?" and "how was everyone held accountable for preparation?" (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Questions related to culture were based on Tosti (2007) and included questions such as "what words would you use to describe your team?" and "how competitive is it for students to become members of this LDE team?" We conducted the interviews via phone and transcribed the audio recordings verbatim. We also collected field notes during and after each interview. 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. This may have impacted how advisors spoke about their teams based on their objective success. We recognize this as a limitation of the study. Interviews ranged from 17 to 63 minutes.

Following the transcription process, we transformed the transcripts into singular units of data. Two researchers separated or disassembled each interview transcript into distinct statements (Yin, 2011) and separated those statements in an excel file. We read each distinct statement and open-coded or classified them into codes and sub-codes in a reassembling process (Creswell, 2002; Yin, 2011). Based on the differences in event focus, outcomes, and participants in each LDE, we aimed to explore norms and culture based on LDE prior to differences and similarities. In the meaning-making process, we used 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. For triangulation and to increase trustworthiness, we sent associated quotes with assigned themes to the interviewees to clarify that the interpretation related to the intention in a process called member checking (Creswell, 2013). Additionally, we used field notes to aid in credibility and trustworthiness. We also acknowledge that our epistemological assumptions—or justificatory account—influence how we produce knowledge (Chamberlain, 2015). Therefore, we practiced reflexivity to examine our own biases and increase trustworthiness, authenticity, and credibility (Creswell, 2013).

Reflexivity Statement

One researcher was a Caucasian, male, traditionally trained agriculture teacher who had taught in the classroom for 17 years and trained students for competition in team-based LDEs. He prepared teams for the Agricultural Issues Forum for nine years, including the year data was collected. His 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 in 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.

He was serving on the Idaho FFA Board of Directors and attended the meetings and voted on motions affecting the timing of the LDEs in this study. Additional researchers were all faculty in departments of agricultural education departments, two at the University of Idaho at the time of the study. They have all served as judges or superintendents for various CDE/LDEs. One was the superintendent for Parliamentary Procedure and CCM in Idaho at the time of the study.

Results

As recommended in case study research, we have prepared a description of each participant (Yin, 2014). 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; however, the teams were formed prior to COVID and the cancellation of the in-person events. Of the participants, three identified as female and nine as male. Experience teaching of participants ranged from 1 to 36 years, with an average number of 19 years. Interviewee 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. In this section, we identify each interview with an abbreviation for their respective LDE (Agricultural Issues = AI, Parliamentary Procedure = PP, Conduct of Chapter Meetings = CCM) and an assigned number for reference throughout the results section.

Table 1

Interviewee 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

RQ 1: 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, a high degree of buy-in, and cooperation.

Team Development as a Process

Team development as a process was one theme that arose from all the interviews with advisors of AI teams. The responses indicated multiple phases of the team development process. AI-1 said they took a while to get on the same page, which they attributed to "becoming comfortable with the topic." This team used a goal sheet to establish a common goal and norms to achieve the goal. "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" (AI-1). Advisors discussed conflict as a part of all the teams' development process. AI-2 talked about some members that "weren't going to dedicate the time" and how the other members were "really frustrated with that process." AI-3 said their conflict was "situational." "Most of the frustration was a lack of communication or lack of perceived work" (AI-3). Advisors also shared the importance of team members taking on roles and working together. AI-4 talked about their students taking on different roles and responsibilities, stating, "I didn't even send the portfolio in. One of the students sent it in." AI-2 shared, "I don't remember a practice with this year's team that was not professional and not well attended." Overall, the AI advisors reflected on the process of bringing members together and assisting through team development.

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, AI-2 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 advisor had a team with diverse backgrounds and agriculture experiences who came together "to passionately educate the public about agriculture" (AI-1).

Cooperation

Interviewees indicated that their teams have a high level of focus on the cooperation element of group processing. In the selection of topics, teams come together to identify issues that are important to themselves and their community. AI-1 discussed how their team identified an issue they learned about in class and connected it to their own community. AI-2 shared how everyone on his team had a tie to their issue: "[The students] belief in the importance of [their selected issues is] 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, AI-3 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.

RQ 2: Describe the Norms and Culture of Parliamentary Procedure Teams

When examining the interviews from the advisors of PP teams, the following three themes emerged: competition/winning, advisor-driven norms and culture, and individual accountability.

Competition/Winning

The focus on competition and winning was prevalent throughout all the interviews and oftentimes the focus of discussion with the advisors of PP teams. All advisors discussed how they kept and posted the scores at each practice. Other advisors discussed how they are upfront with the students about how competitive the event is and how they need to be competitive and willing to invest. PP-3 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. PP-1 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." PP-2 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 win.

Advisor-driven Norms and Culture

PP team advisors shared they have clear expectations that they establish, and the advisor typically runs the team. Regarding the practice schedule, PP-3 said, "I guided that process." PP-1 stated, "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." Based on the teams being advisor driven, the team advisors tended to discuss skipping the forming and storming phases of team development. Rather they have a culture of how PP is done and the norms are already set. Of the different LDEs, the advisors for this event had the most coaching experience with the fewest years at 15 years. Over time, advisors develop a way of doing things. PP-1 shared that they have an established method for ending the 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" (PP-1).

Individual Accountability

Individual accountability is a high priority for the advisors of PP teams. Multiple advisors post the 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" (PP-3). PP-2 said posting scores "lends itself to trust between the coach and the teammates and everybody on that team." All the advisors shared different tactics they use for holding individuals accountable and promoting the need for individual student work. The advisors described how leaders emerge to teach other members the already set norms. Often these leaders have competed on the team before. On forming the team, PP-2 said, "our chairman and one other young lady coordinated that (initial meeting) to reach everybody." PP-1 had a student do "weekly reminders via text." After the schools shut down, PP-3 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." PP-1 said, "a particular student went above and beyond in managing the chairmanship ... It was pretty obvious who our chairman was going to be."

RQ3: Describe the Norms and Culture of CCM Teams

When examining the interviews from the advisors of CCM, three themes emerged: focus on the experience, advisor-driven norms and culture, and motivated.

Focus on the Experience

CCM advisors focus on the enjoyment of the process and want members to stick with it and continue to compete year after year. One advisor said, "we just kind of gathered up some kids …we hope in the future that we'll obviously have more than enough kids to want to do it" (CCM-1). CCM-3 commented that this was only their second year doing it, "I was looking for something for the middle school kids to get involved with." Because of their involvement in the first year, CCM-3 shared, "I've already seen the benefits in the chapter as a whole. Those middle school kids … are now active members of the chapter." These advisors shared how they use the event as a way to get individuals involved in middle school and keep them involved through high school. The advisors described the teams as emergent—they start out with low skill levels and develop social skills as they progress. CCM-3 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." The advisors work to promote group processing. CCM-4 shared how students learned to handle conflict:

> There were a couple of girls who had issues from the past. Both let me know about it and I was like, well now is your time to grow up … 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.

When selecting positions for their team CCM-1 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 creating roles and taking on responsibilities. All these advisors described how they use this event as an opportunity for students to learn how to work on a team with others and develop communication and social skills.

Advisor-driven Norms and Culture

The advisors of CCM teams described their teams as more advisor driven. Advisors set norms, determined assignments, and helped resolve conflicts. CCM-2 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." CCM-3 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, CCM-1 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 dealing with conflict, CCM-4 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 they set, but the focus was on student development.

Motivated

The advisors of CCM teams described their students as motivated. CCM-2 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." CCM-3 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.

RQ 4: Differences in the Team Norms and Culture of Teams Based on LDE

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

Advisor-driven versus Student-driven Norms

The advisors of the PP and CCM described more advisor-driven behaviors. while advisors of the AI teams tended to describe student-driven teams. CCM-2 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, "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" (PP-3). These are just a few examples of how the advisors tended to set norms and drive the team culture.

On teams that had more of a student focus, we saw more of a goal development process, group processing, and positive interdependence. According to AI-2, "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." AI-3 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 AI teams, the student focus was discussed at a lower prevalence for CCM and PP teams.

Shared Cultural Themes

Several similarities in cultural themes existed, including adaptability, cooperation, dedication, focus, and resilience emerged. Overall, all teams were adaptable. This norm was especially prevalent this year when discussing the impact of changes in the LDE due to COVID-19. Some of these teams completely stepped away from the events, other teams forged through and practiced via technology, and others reduced the number of practices in exchange for longer practices. The way cooperation was discussed varied across the board. Some teams focused on the element of group processing. Other teams focused on individual accountability, which was heavily discussed with advisors of Parliamentary Procedure teams.

Team-based LDE teams do not qualify for state by just showing up, but rather the team advisors all described the culture of dedication and norms related to this environment that needs to be built 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. The advisors of team-based LDE teams described their students as focused. The advisors described how their students stayed focused and the importance of focus for the students to be prepared for their respective

competitions. 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. The advisors shared 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.

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications

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 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. CCM team norms are advisor driven, the focus of the advisors is to engage students in the experience in the hopes of developing 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. Advisors with student-driven norms described greater team development and cooperation skills. Common cultural themes included adaptability, resilience, cooperation, focus, and determination.

Advisors interviewed about their Agricultural Issues Forum teams discussed how they demonstrated all phases of team development (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977) which led to the development of team norms and culture. Discussions about forming the team and getting everyone on the same page differed for each team; the power of allowing students to go through each phase in the process is notable. Team members learned how to emotionally engage with each other and create harmony to accomplish a task. They also learned how to identify potential problems. 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).

As described by the advisors, Parliamentary Procedure and CCM teams may skip or spend little time in the storming phase through advisor-driven norms. Storming appears to cause 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) and is healthy for team and skill development. Agricultural Issues advisors discussed the storming phase throughout the development and progression of their student-driven norms; 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 and provides greater evidence for increased skill development. We recommend advisors and coaches encourage student-driven norms and carve out time for the forming and storming phases—including team goal and norm development—for true team development to increase employability and team skill development.

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. 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 (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). We recommend that Parliamentary Procedure and CCM advisors work to adapt their coaching practices to build these elements of cooperation.

Advisors view Parliamentary Procedure as a very competitive event in Idaho. High prestige is given to winning teams; so, they want to win. This objective success is a focus of both students and advisors. Also evident was the set norms each team used 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 were discussed by advisors. Storming phases were cut short or nonexistent as advisors kept practices focused. These findings indicated the focus on winning and competition may be taking away from the team development process and, therefore, student's ability to develop team 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 team members? Are they really teams or groups? Do they develop the leadership skills intended? These are all questions that should further be explored.

CCM teams have seventh to ninth-grade members. All the advisors interviewed had developed their teams through classes. Advisors recruited students, set practice times and 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 ownership of 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). A culture of cooperation is essential for teams to function and a skill employers expect all employees to have before hiring (Murti, 2014). We contend these components of team development will lead to transferability after the team adjourns and the development of cooperation skills.

We expected team-based LDE teams to experience all the phases of team development; however, interviews suggested otherwise. Agricultural Issues teams were student driven in terms of norms and culture and experienced each of the phases of team development. Youth that have student-driven experiences become active agents of their own development (Larson et al.,

2005). Both Parliamentary Procedure and CCM team norms and culture were more advisor driven. Advisor-driven experiences have their own advantages. For example, they engage in specially designed learning experiences that teach self-confidence, interpersonal skills, and a sense of responsibility (Larson et al., 2005). Parliamentary Procedure and CCM are task-focused and have a structure that aids in accomplishing their task. However, the level of interdependence was relatively low, leading us to ask if they are groups rather than teams (Franz, 2012).

Every advisor discussed their team's end goal. Each of these goals was explicitly objective in nature (Abele et al., 2016), placing in the top four or winning the state event. Coaches also shared subjective goals for their teams; although not as explicit as the objective goals, the subjective goals were important for some teams. More research should be conducted to understand the subjective results each team experienced. Performing teams accomplish tasks and continually measure their progress toward their goals. Thus, focus and dedication lead to success (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004).

Student-driven norms and culture are best if the goal is to develop employability skills that will translate into careers (Larson et al., 2005). The roles of students and advisors should be clearly established early in the forming phase (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004). Roles include the responsibilities everyone will take on for the duration of the event. Students should establish a set of expectations for each other and the advisor. Allowing students to do so creates buy-in for members, and 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 often much higher.

To cultivate dedication and focus on a team, a norming session should take place as soon as a team forms. The use of a goal sheet may help students to lead the norming process. The norming process should include the identification of shared goals, a timeline for achieving the goals, norms for the group, consequences for not conforming to norms, and a platform to critique individuals and the group (Ericksen & Dyer, 2004; Janicik & Bartel, 2003). Engaging in the norming process allows members to provide input, hear concerns from other members, and identify roles each member will take in the team. This will in turn lead to the targeted employability skills related to teams that can be achieved through participation in these events (Lundry et al., 2015).

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 to take on a leadership role? What were the students' experiences? The student versus advisor driven aspect of this research should be expanded upon with additional research. We have made assumptions that student-driven norms lead to more team development based on previous literature, but this was not examined in this study. Does a team whose focus is on the product (winning), lose out when it comes to the process? Specifically, are the teams that win developing team-building skills? Advisors may have a different perspective than their students. Additional research is needed to answer these questions.

References

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:// doi.org/10.1006/s10902-015-9662-4

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. (2016a). A case study of learning, motivation, and performance strategies for teaching and coaching CDE teams. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 57*(3), 115-128. https://doi.org/jae.2016.03115

Ball, A. L., Bowling, A., & Sharpless, J. D. (2016b). An Observational Analysis of Coaching Behaviors for Career Development Event Teams: A Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 57*(3), 101–114. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2016.03101

Bird, W. A., Haug, K., & Henry [Ball], A.L. (2013). Is competition conducive to learning? An exploration of student experiences during competitive career technical student organization events. *Proceedings of the American Educational Research Association Conference.* San Francisco, CA.

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. (2008). *The perceptions held by FFA members of employability skill development associated with agriculture Career Development Events.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Missouri.

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.

Bowling, A. M., & Ball, A. L. (2020). More than winning: A mixed methods grounded theory investigation of the career development event preparation process. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 61*(4), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2020.04001

Bowling, A. M., & Torres, R. M. (2010). Frequency of coaching behaviors used by agricultural teachers in relation to the state floriculture career development event team rank. *Proceedings of the North Central Region AAAE Research Conference*, Manhattan, KS.

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

Chamberlan, K. (2015). Epistemology and qualitative research. In P. Rohleder & A. C. Lyons (Eds.), *Qualitative research in clinical and health psychology* (pp. 9–28). Pagrave Mcmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-29105-9

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., & Fink, W. (2020). *From academia to the workforce: Critical growth areas for students today.* Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

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.

Currie, B. (2019). Are we building leaders or trophy cases? *The Agricultural Education Magazine, 92*(2), 5-7. https://www.naae.org/profdevelopment/magazine/archive_issues/Volume92/2019%2009%20--%20Sept%20Oct.pdf

Curry, K. W. (2017). *Motivations of FFA Career Development Event Competitors and Coaches* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). North Carolina State University.

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

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. R. (2014). Describing the relationship between coaching behaviors and student performance at the national FFA parliamentary procedure career development event. *Proceedings of the National AAAE Research Conference*, Snow Bird, UT.

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

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.

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

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

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

Jacox, B. (2019). What are the key qualities and skills of an effective team coach?. In D. Clutterbuck, J. Gannon, S. Hayes, I. Iordanou, K. Lowe, D. MacKie (Eds.), *The practitioner's handbook of team coaching* (pp. 353-364). Routledge.

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. https://doi.org/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 to school-based, agricultural education (SBAE): A historical review. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 60*(1), 109-128. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2019.01109

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, 89–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-386492-5.00005-1

Larson, R., Walker, K., & Pearce, N. (2005). 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.

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

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

Murti, A. B. (2014). Why soft skills matter. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills, 8*(3), 32-36. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2636655

National FFA Organization. (n.d.). *National FFA Organization*. https://www.ffa.org/

Nowak, Z., Pavelock, D., Ullrich, D. R., & Wolfskill, L. A. (2019). Leadership styles of successful FFA advisors and FFA programs. *Journal of Leadership Education, 18*(1), 45-67. https://doi.org/10.12806/V18/I1/R4

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

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

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

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.

Scott, J. D. (2023). *Examining the impact that involvement in FFA and 4-H has on student college and career readiness in Georgia* (Publication No. 30313586) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

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

Smalley, S. W., & Sands, K. R. (2018). Perception of students' preparedness for careers in agriculture through an FFA career development event. *NACTA Journal, 62*(4), 308-312. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26769580

Smith, K. L., & Thapa, B. (2022). Examining differences in noncognitive skills for state-level career development and leadership development event participants. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 63*(2), 251-265. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2022.02251

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

Stripling, C. T., & Ricketts, J. C. (2016). Research priority 3: Sufficient scientific and professional workforce that addresses the challenges of the 21st century. In T. G. Roberts, A. Harder, & M. T. Brashears (Eds.), *American Association for Agricultural Education national research agenda: 2016-2020* (pp. 29–35)*.* Gainesville, FL: Department of Agricultural Education and Communication.

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://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000059

Tosti, D. T. (2007). Aligning the Culture and Strategy for Success. *Performance Improvement, 46*(1), 21–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.035

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.

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

Voigt, M. A., Talbert, B. A., McKinley, S., & Brady, C. M. (2013). Promising coaching practices of expert dairy, horse, and livestock career development event coaches: A qualitative study. *NACTA Journal, 57*(2), 45-55.

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

Woodbury, T. J. (2006). Building organizational culture—word by word. *Leader to Leader*, *2006*(39), 48–54.

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

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research design and methods* (5th edition). Thousand Oaks.