

An Examination of the Team Dynamics of Idaho FFA Alumni and Supporters Leadership Council (ASLC)

Anna Pratt, RyAnna Meacham, & Sarah A. Bush, University of Idaho



Introduction

- Individuals provide many services through giving of their time and talent to school-based agricultural education programs at the local, regional, and state level (Tillinghast, Ramsey, & Terry, 2013).
- Barriers to volunteering can affect the longevity and commitment of these individuals (Culp, 2012; Dodd & Boleman, 2007).
- The ASLC identified a lack of clear and consequential direction and lack of organization and structure in the leadership team as the two most prevalent issues (J. Kelly, personal communication, November 9, 2018).

Conceptual Framework

- The conceptual framework for this study was based on the model of team effectiveness (Hackman, 1987).
- The Team Diagnostic Survey (TDS) was developed to examine team effectiveness when members feel responsible for the teams' success and are compelled by the work (Wageman, Hackman, and Lehman, 2005).
- The level of effort team members exert and the amount of knowledge and skill they bring to the organization are also factors (Franz, 2012; Hackman, 2002).

Methods

- Two sections of the TDS: supportive organizational context and compelling direction.
- For supportive organizational context, questions pertained the following were added.
 - availability of team rewards and recognition
 - information sharing and support
 - training and technical consultation
 - basic material resources
- Respondents utilized a 5-point Likert-type (1 = highly inaccurate to 5 = highly accurate).
- Population for this study were five officers and ten regional representatives for the leadership council (N = 15) the sample included 13 council members.
- We followed recommendations from Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009)

Results

All Participants (n = 13)	M	SD
Supportive Organization	3.45	0.52
Compelling Direction	3.08	0.22
9 or Less Years of Experience (n = 6)		
Supportive Organization	3.37	0.60
Compelling Direction	3.03	0.27
10 or More Years of Experience (n = 7)		
Supportive Organization	3.52	0.48
Compelling Direction	3.12	0.18

Conclusions/Recommendations

↑ Supportive Organization

Commonly reported TDS score $M = 3.33$. Participants feel slightly positive about the availability of resources and support, recognition, and access to information. However, those with 9 or less years of experience reported lower views.

↓ Compelling Direction

Commonly reported TDS score as $M = 3.08$. On average individuals on this team feel the team does not have a clear, challenging, and consequential direction.



More Experience
Increased Views

Less Experience
Decreased Views



This Team Should

- Invest in Visioning Process
- Create Clear and Defined Roles
- Provide Socialization for New Members
- Use the 60-30-10 Energy Allocation

References

- Culp, K., III. (2012). Overview of the GEMS model of volunteer administration: Generate, educate, mobilize, and sustain. *The Journal of Extension*, 50 (6). Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/2012december/tt10.php>
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dodd, C., & Boleman, C. (2007). *Volunteer administration in the 21st Century: ISOTURE: A model for volunteer management*. Retrieved from <https://agrilife.cdn.tamu.edu/od/files/2010/06/Isoture-model-for-volunteermanagement-E-457.pdf>
- Kelly, J. (2018, November 9). Personal interview.
- Hackman, J. R. (1987). The design of work teams. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 315-342). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Tillinghast, S. A., Ramsey, J. W., & Terry, Jr., R. (2013). Teacher perceptions of adult volunteers serving local, school-based agricultural education programs. *Proceedings of the Western American Association Agricultural Education research conference*, 32, 78-92.
- Wageman, R., Hackman, J. R., Lehman, E. (2005). Team diagnostic survey: Developing an instrument. *The Journal of Applied Behavior Science*, 41(4), 373-398. doi: 10.1177/0021886305281984