

# Tasks Associated with Teaching School-Based Agricultural Education: FFA Advisement

Ryan W. Best<sup>1</sup>

J. Shane Robinson<sup>2</sup>

M. Craig Edwards<sup>3</sup>

Robert Terry, Jr.<sup>4</sup>

Ki L. Cole<sup>5</sup>

## Abstract

*School-based agricultural education (SBAE) teachers are expected to complete a variety of tasks related to their profession. These tasks are associated with a wide range of roles, responsibilities, and functions. One such area in which teachers are expected to complete tasks is advising an FFA chapter. Although the general tasks associated with teaching SBAE can be inferred from teacher needs, challenges, and characteristics of effective teachers, literature is scarce regarding the specific tasks SBAE teachers are expected to complete. The purpose of this study was to identify tasks SBAE teachers are expected to perform in association with advising an FFA chapter during a typical year. A three-round, modified Delphi approach was used to meet the study's objective. The Delphi panel of experts was composed of doctoral degree-seeking students in agricultural education across the nation with three or more years of SBAE teaching experience. The panel identified 80 tasks in 12 themes that achieved consensus related to advising an FFA chapter. These tasks indicated that SBAE teachers are competitive in FFA events, manage administrative tasks related to FFA chapters, and engage with the local community regarding a chapter's public relations. These findings have implications for teacher preparation programs and in-service teacher professional development offerings.*

## Introduction

SBAE teachers are expected to complete a variety of tasks related to their jobs (Traini et al., 2021). These tasks are associated with a wide range of roles, responsibilities, and functions (Phipps et al., 2008; Talbert et al., 2022, Terry & Briers, 2010). As such, these tasks can be inferred from literature related to the needs of teachers (DiBenedetto et al., 2018; Roberts et al., 2020), the challenges faced by teachers (Boone & Boone, 2007, 2009), and the characteristics of effective teachers (Eck et al., 2019; Roberts & Dyer, 2004). The mixture of expectations associated with these tasks creates a complex environment in which teachers are expected to operate (Haddad et al., 2023; Traini et al., 2021). This complexity and the resulting

---

<sup>1</sup> Ryan W. Best is an Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education in the Department of Agricultural Education and Studies at Iowa State University, 0217C Curtiss Hall, 513 Farm House Road, Ames, IA 50011, [rbest@iastate.edu](mailto:rbest@iastate.edu). ORCID# 0009-0001-0835-8934.

<sup>2</sup> J. Shane Robinson is a Department Head and Professor of Agricultural Education in the Department of Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership at Oklahoma State University, 225 Agricultural Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078, [shane.robinson@okstate.edu](mailto:shane.robinson@okstate.edu). ORCID# 0000-0001-9506-5752.

<sup>3</sup> M. Craig Edwards is a Professor of Agricultural Education in the Department of Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership at Oklahoma State University, 240 Agricultural Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078, [craig.edwards@okstate.edu](mailto:craig.edwards@okstate.edu). ORCID# 0000-0002-4436-4450.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Terry, Jr. is a Professor of Agricultural Education in the Department of Agricultural Education, Communications and Leadership at Oklahoma State University, 235 Agricultural Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078, [rob.terry@okstate.edu](mailto:rob.terry@okstate.edu). ORCID# 0000-0003-4485-0149.

<sup>5</sup> Ki L. Cole is a Professor of Research, Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics in the College of Education, Health, and Aviation at Oklahoma State University, 313 Willard Hall, Stillwater, OK 74078, [ki.cole@okstate.edu](mailto:ki.cole@okstate.edu). ORCID# 0000-0002-0566-010X.

expectations placed on SBAE teachers may lead them to leave the profession prematurely (Lemons et al., 2015; Solomonson & Retallick, 2018). A role in which teachers are expected to perform job-specific tasks is advising the FFA chapters affiliated with their SBAE programs:

The single greatest resource an FFA chapter can have is a highly motivated and well-qualified agriculture teacher as the advisor. Furthermore, the role of the FFA advisor is specific to the agriculture teacher. No one else—parent, alumnus, sponsor, or administrator—can serve in that role. Because FFA is a component of instruction, the FFA advisor is the gatekeeper to all the things FFA members can do in the organization. Therefore, the best interest of students is served by having an advisor with a good understanding of FFA and the leadership skills necessary to help students grow personally and professionally through their FFA experience. (Talbert et al., 2022, p. 451)

FFA is a “dynamic youth organization that changes lives and prepares members for premier leadership, personal growth and career success through agricultural education” (National FFA Organization, 2023a, para. 1). FFA is structured into three levels: local chapters, state associations, and the National FFA Organization, which offers students opportunities for success and recognition at each level (National FFA Organization, 2023a). FFA serves as an intracurricular student organization intended to promote the application of skills acquired through classroom and laboratory instruction and students’ Supervised Agricultural Experiences (SAE; Hughes & Barrick, 1993). The organization provides opportunities for students to demonstrate their skills through career and leadership development events (CDEs and LDEs), agriscience fairs, proficiency and star awards, achievement of degrees, and chapter-based award programs (National FFA Organization, 2023a). These opportunities emerge through competitive events, conventions, and conferences, which serve as motivation for students to learn (Jones & Edwards, 2019). These opportunities are key given SBAE teachers are advisors of FFA chapters and facilitate activities associated with operating effective local organizations (Phipps et al., 2008).

Further, an essential role of SBAE teachers includes FFA advisement as it relates to the chapter functioning as a student leadership organization (Talbert et al., 2022). Prior literature indicates that students’ leadership abilities are positively related to their involvement in FFA (Park & Dyer, 2005). Specifically, FFA chapters enhance students’ leadership skills through implementation of officer roles, student-led committees, and a well-developed program of activities (POA; National FFA Organization, 2023b; Talbert et al., 2022). Moreover, students engaged in FFA participation experience greater fulfillment as a result of their involvement in the organization (Rose et al., 2016). To this point, FFA advisors are the “directors for achieving all sought-after learning outcomes” (Newcomb et al., 2025, chapter 11, para. 20), including through FFA leadership activities such as chapter offices and student-led committees (Talbert et al., 2022). As such, SBAE teachers play a crucial role in student learning through the facilitation and management of their FFA chapters as part of the comprehensive SBAE model (Croom, 2008).

SBAE teachers are expected to inform students of FFA activities and provide opportunities for their engagement (Smalley & Rank, 2019; Talbert et al., 2022). Activities include FFA meetings, CDEs, LDEs, chapter banquets, conventions, officer elections, and agriscience fair participation (Doss & Rayfield, 2021). Teachers should also provide students with opportunities to engage with members of their local communities to enhance learning experiences (Sherman & Sorensen, 2020). Managing a comprehensive SBAE program that adequately provides opportunities for students in these areas may increase teachers’ workloads, which often leads to stress (Torres et al., 2009). However, SBAE teachers may find it difficult to manage these expectations while balancing obligations in their personal lives (Murray et al., 2011; Sorensen & McKim, 2014; Sorensen et al., 2016). If considering the impact of teacher workload on recruitment and retention of qualified SBAE instructors (Torres et al., 2008), as well as teacher stress (Theiman et al., 2012), burnout (Kitchel et al., 2012), satisfaction (Chenevey et al., 2008), and efficacy (McKim & Velez, 2016), identifying the specific tasks related to teaching SBAE would delineate teachers’ workloads and have significant implications for their professional practice. Moreover, identification of the

tasks SBAE teachers are expected to perform would impact teacher preparation programs and better inform aspiring SBAE teachers of their future job roles, allowing them to determine whether such is an appropriate occupational fit.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Human capital theory (HCT) served as the study's theoretical framework. HCT evaluates the acquisition of an individual's education, experiences, knowledge, skills, and training (Becker, 1964; Little, 2003; Schultz, 1971; Smith, 2010; Smylie, 1996). An important aspect of HCT involves the explanation of employability regarding the investments individuals make in themselves and the attractiveness of their skills to prospective employers (Becker, 1964); therefore, "as people increase their human capital, they become more employable . . ." (Robinson & Baker, 2013, p. 152). As such, Smith (2010) found that individuals tended to acquire specialized skills when moving toward work they preferred, giving rise to the recognition of "sector-specific" (p. 42) skills, which complement natural talents and occupational abilities. In addition, Heckman (2000) contended that individuals' job performances were enhanced by acquiring and developing such skills. Moreover, increased job performance due to enhanced human capital is associated with improved results for employers (Lepak & Snell, 1999).

HCT may also explain a teacher's value to their respective school (Smylie, 1996), and can be used to describe job-specific tasks as well as the value placed on such (Autor & Handel, 2013). Autor et al. (2003) found that jobs can be classified by the primary tasks expected to be completed by employees, and the value of the skills required to perform those tasks are assessable. It is difficult, however, to measure and connect these tasks and skills to the acquisition of human capital (Autor & Handel, 2013). Regarding this aim, Autor and Handel (2013) proposed that individuals choose tasks based on their perceived value to a job's expectations, realizing such may vary greatly based on specific demands of the job in question.

Gibbons and Waldman (2004) also found that tasks are central to a worker's value, coining the phrase "task-specific human capital" (p. 203), i.e., ". . . some of the human capital an individual acquires on the job is specific to the tasks being performed . . ." (p. 203). Garland (1985) defined a task as "a body of work requiring mental and/or physical activity" (p. 346). In formal settings, tasks are often an individual's role and responsibility to master, and they can be either "self-selected or assigned by a superior or co-worker" (Garland, 1985, p. 346). Lewin (1951) posited that tasks predispose individuals to perceive tension or stress, resulting in experiencing cognitive and physical activities, or both. Similar to other types of human capital, task-specific human capital is dependent on the nature of the work, allowing for the skills acquired to be transferred readily from one job to another (Gibbons & Waldman, 2004). The authors maintained that this transfer reinforces the notion of task-specific human capital as widely valued in industries, and, when acquired, offers enhanced employability to workers. Human capital acquisition, therefore, is linked to proficiency in performing various and specific tasks (Gibbons & Waldman, 2004). Task-specific human capital implies that value is inherent in the skills needed to complete job-specific tasks (Gibbons & Waldman, 2004). As such, tasks are imperative to job performance and support skill acquisition (Autor et al., 2003; Autor & Handel, 2013); so, the identification of tasks was in concert with the study's theoretical framework.

### **Purpose**

All jobs require employees to perform a variety of general and specific tasks (Smith, 2010). Being competent at both sets of tasks is especially true for those teaching SBAE (Torres et al., 2008; 2009). General tasks include, but are not limited to, completing extensive paperwork, working overtime, and meeting deadlines—all of which can create stress for teachers (Torres et al., 2009). Identifying the specific tasks required of SBAE teachers has been difficult to determine. Although the tasks of teaching SBAE can be inferred from the aforementioned professional needs, challenges, and characteristics, limited literature

exists detailing the specific tasks SBAE teachers are expected to perform, especially in association with FFA advisement. A comprehensive list of these tasks would offer insight into the daily demands of the profession and provide direction for future research in the field. To better understand the demands placed on SBAE teachers in the form of workload, Traini et al. (2021) recommended that the development of a “flexible position description of the agriculture teaching job detailing tasks that are expected as well as those that are not expected” (p. 179) should be a priority. Therefore, the purpose and objective of this portion of a larger study was to identify the tasks SBAE teachers are expected to perform as FFA advisors.

### **Methods**

This study was part of a more comprehensive investigation (Best et al., 2024; Best et al., 2025a). The methods of the larger study are presented here, including the procedures yielding the findings reported in this manuscript. A modified Delphi method was used to meet the study’s objective. This method is considered a multiple-round approach (Best et al., 2025b) to collecting data where “three iterations are often sufficient to collect the needed information and to reach a consensus in most cases” (Hsu & Sandford, 2007, p. 2).

The study’s population of interest was doctoral degree-seeking students in agricultural education who were enrolled at public universities in the United States during the fall semester of 2022. The study’s respondent frame consisted of students identified by department heads of agricultural education academic units across the nation. This population was selected as experts due to their unique perspectives on SBAE and higher education in agricultural education, i.e., recent or current practitioners as well as burgeoning teacher educators and researchers. As former or current SBAE teachers, this population was identified as an appropriate group of potential Delphi panelists because of their knowledge of, competence in, and experience with SBAE, as well as their desires to pursue terminal professional degrees in agricultural education. Their understanding of the philosophy of SBAE through higher education coursework coupled with SBAE teaching experience qualified them as unique experts who met the study’s criteria and were in accordance with the following recommendations of Hsu and Sandford (2007) and Stitt-Gohdes and Crews (2004) for selecting Delphi panelists:

1. Enrolled in a doctoral program (PhD or EdD) in agricultural education with aspirations of joining the professoriate or advanced leadership positions;
2. A minimum of three years of SBAE teaching experience; and
3. “[H]ighly trained and competent within the specialized area of knowledge” (Hsu & Sandford, 2007, p. 3), in this case SBAE.

In total, 22 universities were identified as offering a doctoral program in agricultural education – 19 as reported by AAAE in 2018 (American Association for Agricultural Education, 2018) and three additional institutions implementing programs after 2018. On September 13, 2022, an electronic mail message was sent to department heads of 22 agricultural education programs offering a doctoral degree requesting the names and email addresses of students enrolled in their doctoral programs. Of those, 13 (59.09%) responded, identifying 40 doctoral students as potential Delphi panelists who met the criteria for inclusion in the study. Subsequent electronic mail messages were sent to panelists for each round with a link embedded to respective instruments requesting their participation in the study following the Tailored Design Method outlined by Dillman et al. (2014). In all, 23 (57.50%) of the initial 40 potential panelists responded in Round 1 of the study and, thereafter, were considered the study’s panel of experts. Twenty-two (95.65%) expert panelists responded in Round 2, and 20 (86.96%) responded in Round 3.

The panel consisted of experts having taught SBAE in 16 different states with programs ranging from 45 to 700 students; approximately one-half of the respondents taught 150 or fewer students. Nine (39.13%) panelists were male, and 14 (60.87%) were female. Twenty-one panelists (91.30%) were white,

and 22 (95.65%) were not Hispanic or Latino. Five (22.00%) were currently teaching SBAE, and 21 (91.30%) had taught SBAE in the past four years. The average number of years of experience teaching SBAE was 8.39 (range of 3 to 21 years). More than 95% ( $f = 22$ ) were traditionally certified. Sixteen respondents (69.56%) were between 25 and 35 years of age. Thirteen panelists (56.52%) taught in communities with populations of fewer than 10,000 persons.

The instruments used in this study were evaluated for face and content validity (Gay et al., 2006) by a group of eight experts considered knowledgeable of social science research and SBAE. These included six teacher educators in agricultural education, one statistician who specialized in survey research and instrument design, and one graduate student who was a former SBAE teacher and seeking an advanced degree in agricultural education at Oklahoma State University. Reliability in Delphi studies is dependent on maintaining a certain threshold of participants throughout the study's duration. Dalkey et al. (1972) indicated that 13 responses are needed to establish a reliability coefficient of .90 in Delphi studies. Due to the response rates of this study exceeding 13 participants per round, and because each round was comprised of the same panel members, the study's results are considered reliable (Dalkey et al., 1972).

The initial electronic mail message was sent to the 40 potential panelists on September 29, 2022, describing the study and inviting them to participate. A Qualtrics survey link to the Round 1 instrument was included that contained questions pertaining to the personal and professional characteristics of the panelists as well as the open-ended question: *What tasks are associated with the roles and responsibilities of a SBAE teacher regarding FFA advisement in a typical year?* Panelists were asked to provide as many responses as they deemed appropriate to answer this question. Tasks identified by the panelists in Round 1 were analyzed using the constant comparison procedure, and any duplicate responses were eliminated (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). Further, this method was used to inductively analyze responses and categorize them by themes (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). Per the suggestion of Creswell and Guetterman (2019), responses were compared to one another and grouped into categories to eliminate redundancy.

Round 2 of the Delphi study sought to establish consensus of agreement among the panelists (Barrios et al., 2021). An electronic mail message was sent to the 23 panelists responding to Round 1 on November 22, 2022, with a Qualtrics survey link to the Round 2 instrument. Tasks identified in Round 1 were presented to panelists to determine their perceived levels of agreement for each. Panelists were asked to indicate their levels of agreement using a four-point, Likert-type scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Agree*, and 4 = *Strongly Agree*). An 80.00% level of agreement was established a priori to reach consensus, i.e., tasks receiving a score of 3 or 4 by 80.00% of the panelists were considered to have reached consensus (Diamond et al., 2014). Tasks achieving 51.00% to 79.99% agreement were retained for use in Round 3. Tasks failing to reach 51.00% agreement among the panelists were removed from further study.

Round 3 of the study sought to refine consensus of agreement among the panelists (Brady, 2015). An electronic mail message was sent to the 22 panelists who responded to Round 2 of the study on December 12, 2022, with a Qualtrics survey link to the Round 3 instrument. Tasks identified in Round 2 that achieved levels of agreement ranging from 51.00% to 79.99% were again presented to the panelists, as demonstrated by Buriak and Shinn (1989). Panelists were asked to indicate whether they agreed the task should be included in the task list by selecting either 1 for *No* or 2 for *Yes*. The 80.00% level of agreement identified a priori was also used for the Round 3 analysis. Tasks receiving this level of agreement were considered to have reached consensus among the panelists and included in the final list of tasks that should be associated with FFA advisement. Tasks that reached levels of agreement of less than 80.00% were considered to have not reached consensus as defined by the study. The items achieving the 80.00% level of agreement in Round 2 and Round 3 were combined to form a final list of tasks. For all three rounds of the study, statistical feedback was reported per the suggestion of Sackman (1974) who indicated that modes of

central tendency and a measure of dispersion (i.e., standard deviation) should be included when reporting the findings of a conventional Delphi study.

## Findings

### Round 1

Panelists identified 296 tasks associated with the roles and responsibilities of a SBAE teacher associated with FFA advisement in a typical year. Duplicate tasks were removed, and 99 tasks across 13 themes remained for consideration in Round 2. Themes identified in Round 1 included: Advisor Expectations ( $f = 6$ ), Awards and Applications ( $f = 9$ ), Chapter Advisement ( $f = 27$ ), Clerical Work ( $f = 19$ ), Community Engagement ( $f = 11$ ), Competitive Student Events ( $f = 6$ ), Fundraising ( $f = 2$ ), Hospitality ( $f = 1$ ), Student Conventions, Conferences, and Camps ( $f = 5$ ), Student Recognition ( $f = 3$ ), Student Relations ( $f = 3$ ), Student Transportation ( $f = 2$ ), and Supervised Agricultural Experiences ( $f = 5$ ).

In corresponding order to the abovementioned themes, the most frequent tasks for each theme included: serve on various FFA committees ( $f = 2$ , 0.68%), assist students in developing proficiency award applications ( $f = 8$ , 2.70%), develop chapter program of activities ( $f = 15$ , 5.07%), plan chapter trips ( $f = 9$ , 3.04%), manage alumni relations ( $f = 5$ , 1.69%), prepare students for career and leadership development events ( $f = 28$ , 9.46%), raise funds for FFA chapter ( $f = 14$ , 4.73%), cook food for FFA events ( $f = 2$ , 0.68%), plan trip to FFA convention ( $f = 4$ , 1.35%), plan FFA chapter banquet ( $f = 8$ , 2.70%), serve as mentor for FFA chapter members ( $f = 1$ , 0.34%), transport students to FFA events ( $f = 9$ , 3.04%), and assist students in keeping records ( $f = 3$ , 1.01%). See Table 1 below.

**Table 1**

*Themes and Tasks Associated with FFA Advisement as a Result of Round 1 (N = 23)*

Themes and Tasks	<i>f</i>	%
Advisor Expectations (6 items)		
Serve on various FFA committees	2	0.68
Host FFA contests	1	0.34
Judge FFA contests	1	0.34
Participate in professional organizations (i.e., NAAE and state agricultural education teacher associations)	1	0.34
Attend state FFA degree review	1	0.34
Attend professional development	1	0.34
Awards and Applications (9 items)		
Assist students in developing proficiency award applications	8	2.70
Assist students in developing state degree applications	3	1.01
Assist students in developing American degree applications	2	0.68
Assist students in developing chapter degree applications	1	0.34
Assist students in developing National Chapter award applications	1	0.34
Assist students in developing star award applications	1	0.34
Edit student award applications	1	0.34
Motivate students to apply for awards	1	0.34
Assist students in applying for scholarships	1	0.34
Chapter Advisement (27 items)		

Themes and Tasks	<i>f</i>	%
Develop chapter Program of Activities	15	5.07
Provide leadership training for chapter officers	10	3.38
Organize chapter meetings	6	2.03
Plan FFA events	6	2.03
Oversee the election of FFA chapter officer team	5	1.69
Manage FFA officer team	5	1.69
Plan chapter officer retreat	3	1.01
Serve as FFA advisor	3	1.01
Promote FFA Chapter	2	0.68
Provide leadership training for chapter members	2	0.68
Recruit future FFA members	2	0.68
Manage FFA official dress materials	2	0.68
Organize FFA officer meetings	2	0.68
Resolve conflicts between FFA members	2	0.68
Delegate chapter tasks to members	2	0.68
Conduct annual review of FFA chapter	2	0.68
Serve as FFA advisor above chapter level	2	0.68
Manage service projects	1	0.34
Manage student-teacher relationships regarding missing classwork	1	0.34
Attend chapter meetings	1	0.34
Provide retention activities for FFA members	1	0.34
Assist FFA officer team with meetings	1	0.34
Coordinate chapter chaos	1	0.34
Motivate students to participate in FFA activities	1	0.34
Budget for chapter Program of Activities	1	0.34
Provide agricultural literacy events	1	0.34
Teach FFA unit to all freshmen	1	0.34
Clerical Work (19 items)		
Plan chapter trips (i.e., field trips, competitions, camps, conferences)	9	3.04
Register students for events/contests	8	2.70
Complete the chapter roster along with dues/fees	6	2.03
Book lodging for chapter events	4	1.35
Purchase supplies/materials for chapter events and activities	4	1.35
Complete required school-wide paperwork (i.e., travel requests, POs, and annual reports)	4	1.35
Secure transportation for organizational events	2	0.68
Write letters of recommendation	2	0.68
Establish a charter for the FFA chapter	1	0.34
Develop chapter newsletter	1	0.34
Monitor student grades for eligibility to leave school	1	0.34
Work with program report forms	1	0.34
Complete nominations for livestock exhibition	1	0.34

Themes and Tasks	<i>f</i>	%
Complete entries for livestock exhibition	1	0.34
Recruit volunteers to work FFA events	1	0.34
Plan meetings	1	0.34
Gain school/administration support/approval	1	0.34
Submit student contest materials (i.e., ag issues portfolio, statements of originality, and agriscience fair reports)	1	0.34
Complete state/national mandated paperwork	1	0.34
Community Engagement (11 items)		
Manage alumni relations	5	1.69
Volunteer for community service activities	4	1.35
Engage with local community	3	1.01
Foster connections in local community	2	0.68
Communicate with students' parents/guardians	2	0.68
Advertise FFA activities to the community	2	0.68
Establish program culture in school/community	1	0.34
Serve as booster club liaison	1	0.34
Communicate with FFA alumni/supporters	1	0.34
Delegate program management to alumni	1	0.34
Plan fall community gatherings	1	0.34
Competitive Student Events (6 items)		
Prepare students for Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience)	28	9.46
Identify volunteers to prepare students for Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience)	3	1.01
Attend Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience)	3	1.01
Set up materials for Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience) practices	1	0.34
Select members to participate in Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience)	1	0.34
Assess Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience) skill development	1	0.34
Fundraising (2 items)		
Raise funds for FFA chapter	14	4.73
Manage funds for FFA chapter	8	2.70
Hospitality (1 item)		
Cook food for FFA events	2	0.68
Student Conventions, Conferences, and Camps (5 items)		
Plan trip to FFA convention (i.e., district, area, state, and national)	4	1.35
Attend FFA convention (i.e., district, area, state, and national)	4	1.35
Attend FFA student conferences (i.e., WLC, COLT, MFE, ALD, and New Century Farmer)	4	1.35
Attend FFA camp (i.e., district, area, state, and national)	3	1.01

Themes and Tasks	<i>f</i>	%
Attend agricultural education teacher meetings (i.e., district, area, state, and national)	3	1.01
Student Recognition (3 items)		
Plan FFA chapter banquet	8	2.70
Facilitate award recognition for FFA success	3	1.01
Plan FFA degree ceremonies	2	0.68
Student Relations (3 items)		
Serve as mentor for FFA chapter members	1	0.34
Serve as parent for FFA chapter members	1	0.34
Serve as counselor for FFA chapter members	1	0.34
Student Transportation (2 items)		
Transport students to FFA events	9	3.04
Supervise students on away FFA trips	2	0.68
Supervised Agricultural Experiences (5 items)		
Assist students in keeping records	3	1.01
Supervise students at livestock shows	3	1.01
Visit student SAE projects	2	0.68
Manage students' livestock projects	1	0.34
Apply for National FFA Service-Learning Grants	1	0.34
Total	296	100.00

*Note.* *f* indicates the number of initial statements provided by panelists which were reduced to a single, unduplicated task; % indicates the task's percentage of the total tasks identified in Round 1.

## Round 2

In Round 2, panelists reached consensus of agreement for 70 of the 99 tasks (70.70%) associated with FFA advisement. Table 2 shows the mean (*M*) and standard deviation (*SD*) of item responses, with lower values indicating more perceived disagreement and higher values indicating more perceived agreement, and the percent of agreement for tasks associated with FFA advisement as part of a comprehensive SBAE program. Percent of agreement was defined as the percentage of panelists selecting 3 (*Agree*) or 4 (*Strongly Agree*) in response to the item. Of the tasks achieving consensus of agreement, 29 reached 100.00% agreement among the panelists (see Table 2). Examples of tasks with the highest mean scores by theme include: attend professional development ( $M = 3.68$ ,  $SD = 0.48$ ), assist students in developing state degree applications ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ), attend chapter meetings ( $M = 3.64$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ), register students for events/contests ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 0.46$ ), establish program culture in school/community ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 0.46$ ), prepare students for career and leadership development events ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 0.46$ ), manage funds for FFA chapter ( $M = 3.64$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ), cook food for FFA events ( $M = 2.45$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ), attend agricultural education teacher meetings ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 0.46$ ), facilitate award recognition for FFA success ( $M = 3.41$ ,  $SD = 0.59$ ), serve as mentor for FFA chapter members ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ), supervise students on away FFA trips ( $M = 3.68$ ,  $SD = 0.48$ ), and assist students in keeping records ( $M = 3.55$ ,  $SD = 0.51$ ). Twenty-four statements reached a level of agreement between 51.00% and 79.99% and advanced to Round 3 for further consideration by the panelists. Five tasks failed to reach at least 51.00% agreement and were eliminated from further study (see Table 2).

**Table 2***Consensus of Agreement for Tasks associated with FFA Advisement as a Result of Round 2 (N = 22)*

Themes and Tasks	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	% Agreement
<b>Advisor Expectations (6 items)</b>			
Attend professional development	3.68	0.48	100.00
Participate in professional organizations (i.e., NAAE and state agricultural education teacher associations)	3.55	0.60	95.45
Attend state FFA degree review	3.27	0.77	81.82
Serve on various FFA committees	3.05	0.84	77.27 <sup>a</sup>
Host FFA contests	2.68	1.04	63.64 <sup>a</sup>
Judge FFA contests	2.50	1.06	54.55 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Awards and Applications (9 items)</b>			
Assist students in developing state degree applications	3.59	0.50	100.00
Assist students in applying for scholarships	3.59	0.59	95.45
Motivate students to apply for awards	3.59	0.73	95.45
Assist students in developing American degree applications	3.55	0.60	95.45
Assist students in developing chapter degree applications	3.45	0.74	95.45
Assist students in developing proficiency award applications	3.45	0.80	90.91
Edit student award applications	3.23	0.75	90.91
Assist students in developing National Chapter award applications	3.27	0.94	86.36
Assist students in developing star award applications	3.18	0.85	81.82
<b>Chapter Advisement (27 items)</b>			
Attend chapter meetings	3.64	0.49	100.00
Manage FFA officer team	3.59	0.50	100.00
Motivate students to participate in FFA activities	3.59	0.50	100.00
Serve as FFA advisor	3.59	0.50	100.00
Assist FFA officer team with meetings	3.50	0.51	100.00
Plan chapter officer retreat	3.50	0.51	100.00
Promote FFA Chapter	3.50	0.51	100.00
Recruit future FFA members	3.45	0.51	100.00
Provide leadership training for chapter officers	3.59	0.59	95.45
Oversee the election of FFA chapter officer team	3.45	0.60	95.45
Provide leadership training for chapter members	3.41	0.67	90.91
Conduct annual review of FFA chapter	3.23	0.75	90.91
Provide retention activities for FFA members	3.23	0.75	90.91
Delegate chapter tasks to members	3.41	0.73	86.36
Budget for chapter Program of Activities	3.32	0.72	86.36
Manage FFA official dress materials	3.27	0.70	86.36
Resolve conflicts between FFA members	3.14	0.64	86.36
Organize FFA officer meetings	3.14	0.71	81.82
Teach FFA unit to all freshmen	3.23	1.11	77.27 <sup>a</sup>
Plan FFA events	3.00	0.82	77.27 <sup>a</sup>

Themes and Tasks	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	% Agreement
Manage service projects	2.95	0.84	72.73 <sup>a</sup>
Develop chapter Program of Activities	2.91	0.81	72.73 <sup>a</sup>
Manage student-teacher relationships regarding missing classwork	2.86	0.89	72.73 <sup>a</sup>
Organize chapter meetings	2.86	0.89	72.73 <sup>a</sup>
Coordinate chapter chaos	2.86	1.21	68.18 <sup>a</sup>
Provide agricultural literacy events	2.86	1.04	68.18 <sup>a</sup>
Serve as FFA advisor above chapter level	2.50	0.91	50.00 <sup>b</sup>
Clerical Work (19 items)			
Register students for events/contests	3.73	0.46	100.00
Book lodging for chapter events	3.68	0.48	100.00
Plan chapter trips (i.e., field trips, competitions, camps, and conferences)	3.68	0.48	100.00
Complete required school-wide paperwork (i.e., travel requests, POs, and annual reports)	3.64	0.49	100.00
Complete state/national mandated paperwork	3.64	0.49	100.00
Gain school/administration support/approval	3.64	0.49	100.00
Write letters of recommendation	3.50	0.51	100.00
Complete the chapter roster along with dues/fees	3.64	0.58	95.45
Secure transportation for organizational events	3.59	0.59	95.45
Purchase supplies/materials for chapter events and activities	3.55	0.60	95.45
Submit student contest materials (i.e., ag issues portfolio, statements of originality, and agriscience fair reports)	3.41	0.67	90.91
Monitor student grades for eligibility to leave school	3.32	0.72	86.36
Recruit volunteers to work FFA events	3.18	0.66	86.36
Work with program report forms	3.18	0.85	81.82
Plan meetings	2.91	0.81	81.82
Establish a charter for the FFA chapter	3.00	0.82	77.27 <sup>a</sup>
Complete entries for livestock exhibition	2.55	1.10	54.55 <sup>a</sup>
Complete nominations for livestock exhibition	2.36	1.09	45.45 <sup>b</sup>
Develop chapter newsletter	2.27	0.63	27.27 <sup>b</sup>
Community Engagement (11 items)			
Establish program culture in school/community	3.73	0.46	100.00
Engage with local community	3.64	0.49	100.00
Communicate with students' parents/guardians	3.50	0.51	100.00
Communicate with FFA alumni/supporters	3.45	0.51	100.00
Foster connections in local community	3.64	0.58	95.45
Advertise FFA activities to the community	3.36	0.58	95.45
Manage alumni relations	3.18	0.91	77.27 <sup>a</sup>
Volunteer for community service activities	2.86	0.77	72.73 <sup>a</sup>
Serve as booster club liaison	2.73	0.88	63.64 <sup>a</sup>
Delegate program management to alumni	2.55	1.01	54.55 <sup>a</sup>
Plan fall community gatherings	2.45	0.91	45.45 <sup>b</sup>

Themes and Tasks	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	% Agreement
Competitive Student Events (6 items)			
Prepare students for Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience)	3.73	0.46	100.00
Set up materials for Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience) practices	3.59	0.50	100.00
Attend Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience)	3.64	0.58	95.45
Assess Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience) skill development	3.55	0.60	95.45
Identify volunteers to prepare students for Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience)	3.32	0.72	86.36
Select members to participate in Career and Leadership Development Events (i.e., CDEs, LDEs, Speaking, and Agriscience)	3.32	0.89	81.82
Fundraising (2 items)			
Manage funds for FFA chapter	3.64	0.49	100.00
Raise funds for FFA chapter	3.36	0.73	86.36
Hospitality (1 item)			
Cook food for FFA events	2.45	1.01	54.55 <sup>a</sup>
Student Conventions, Conferences, and Camps (5 items)			
Attend agricultural education teacher meetings (i.e., district, area, state, and national)	3.73	0.46	100.00
Plan trip to FFA convention (i.e., district, area, state, and national)	3.64	0.49	100.00
Attend FFA convention (i.e., district, area, state, and national)	3.55	0.74	95.45
Attend FFA camp (i.e., district, area, state, and national)	3.18	0.96	81.82
Attend FFA student conferences (i.e., WLC, COLT, MFE, ALD, and New Century Farmer)	2.95	1.00	77.27 <sup>a</sup>
Student Recognition (3 items)			
Facilitate award recognition for FFA success	3.41	0.59	95.45
Plan FFA chapter banquet	3.27	0.70	86.36
Plan FFA degree ceremonies	3.14	0.89	77.27 <sup>a</sup>
Student Relations (3 items)			
Serve as mentor for FFA chapter members	3.59	0.50	100.00
Serve as counselor for FFA chapter members	3.09	0.92	72.73 <sup>a</sup>
Serve as parent for FFA chapter members	2.41	1.10	50.00 <sup>b</sup>
Student Transportation (2 items)			
Supervise students on away FFA trips	3.68	0.48	100.00
Transport students to FFA events	3.45	0.80	90.91
Supervised Agricultural Experiences (5 items)			
Assist students in keeping records	3.55	0.51	100.00
Visit student SAE projects	3.36	0.85	86.36

Themes and Tasks	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	% Agreement
Apply for National FFA Service-Learning Grants	2.91	0.87	68.18 <sup>a</sup>
Supervise students at livestock shows	2.64	1.14	59.09 <sup>a</sup>
Manage students' livestock projects	2.41	1.14	54.55 <sup>a</sup>

*Note.* Respondents used a 4-point scale: 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly Agree*). Smaller mean (*M*) values indicate stronger disagreement, and larger mean values indicate stronger agreement. <sup>a</sup>Denotes a consensus of agreement ranging between 51.00% and 79.99%. <sup>b</sup>Denotes that consensus of agreement was less than 51.00%.

### Round 3

A dichotomous approach was used to assess agreement (i.e., *Yes* or *No*) in Round 3 of the study. Of the 24 tasks achieving between 51.00% and 79.99% agreement in Round 2, panelists reached consensus of agreement (80.00% or more selecting *Yes*) for 10 additional tasks across four themes: Advisor Expectations ( $f = 1$ ), Chapter Advisement ( $f = 6$ ), Community Engagement ( $f = 2$ ), and Student Recognition ( $f = 1$ ). However, 14 tasks failed to reach consensus of agreement and were eliminated from additional study. Examples of tasks failing to reach consensus included: judge FFA contests ( $M = 1.65$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ), develop chapter program of activities ( $M = 1.75$ ,  $SD = 0.44$ ), establish a charter for the FFA chapter ( $M = 1.75$ ,  $SD = 0.44$ ), volunteer for community service activities ( $M = 1.75$ ,  $SD = 0.44$ ), cook food for FFA events ( $M = 1.40$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ), attend FFA student conferences ( $M = 1.75$ ,  $SD = 0.44$ ), serve as counselor for FFA chapter members ( $M = 1.65$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ), and apply for National FFA service-learning grants ( $M = 1.65$ ,  $SD = 0.49$ ). Table 3 displays the results of Round 3.

**Table 3**

*Final Consensus of Agreement for Tasks associated with FFA Advisement as a Result of Round 3 (N = 20)*

Themes and Tasks	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	% Agreement
Advisor Expectations (3 items)			
Serve on various FFA committees	1.80	0.41	80.00
Judge FFA contests	1.65	0.49	65.00 <sup>a</sup>
Host FFA contests	1.55	0.51	55.00 <sup>a</sup>
Chapter Advisement (8 items)			
Manage student-teacher relationships regarding missing classwork	1.90	0.31	90.00
Provide agricultural literacy events	1.90	0.31	90.00
Manage service projects	1.85	0.37	85.00
Teach FFA unit to all freshmen	1.85	0.37	85.00
Organize chapter meetings	1.80	0.41	80.00
Plan FFA events	1.80	0.41	80.00
Coordinate chapter chaos	1.75	0.44	75.00 <sup>a</sup>
Develop chapter Program of Activities	1.75	0.44	75.00 <sup>a</sup>
Clerical Work (2 items)			
Establish a charter for the FFA chapter	1.75	0.44	75.00 <sup>a</sup>
Complete entries for livestock exhibition	1.50	0.51	50.00 <sup>a</sup>
Community Engagement (4 items)			
Manage alumni relations	1.85	0.37	85.00

Themes and Tasks	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	% Agreement
Serve as booster club liaison	1.80	0.41	80.00
Volunteer for community service activities	1.75	0.44	75.00 <sup>a</sup>
Delegate program management to alumni	1.50	0.51	50.00 <sup>a</sup>
Hospitality (1 item)			
Cook food for FFA events	1.40	0.50	40.00 <sup>a</sup>
Student Conventions, Conferences, and Camps (1 item)			
Attend FFA student conferences (i.e., WLC, COLT, MFE, ALD, and New Century Farmer)	1.75	0.44	75.00 <sup>a</sup>
Student Recognition (1 item)			
Plan FFA degree ceremonies	1.85	0.37	85.00
Student Relations (1 item)			
Serve as counselor for FFA chapter members	1.65	0.49	65.00 <sup>a</sup>
Supervised Agricultural Experiences (3 items)			
Apply for National FFA Service-Learning Grants	1.65	0.49	65.00 <sup>a</sup>
Supervise students at livestock shows	1.50	0.51	50.00 <sup>a</sup>
Manage students' livestock projects	1.40	0.50	40.00 <sup>a</sup>

*Note.* Mean scores in Round 3 based on *Yes* (2) or *No* (1) responses. Smaller mean (*M*) values indicate stronger disagreement, and larger mean values indicate stronger agreement. <sup>a</sup>Denotes that the item was eliminated due to achieving less than 80.00% agreement.

### Final Analysis

Tasks achieving at least an 80.00% consensus of agreement in both Round 2 (70 tasks) and Round 3 (10 tasks) were compiled as a final list of tasks regarding FFA advisement in SBAE. In total, 80 tasks comprising 12 themes reached consensus of agreement (see Tables 2 and 3). Advisor Expectations had 57.14% ( $f = 4$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Awards and Applications had 100.00% ( $f = 9$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Chapter Advisement had 88.89% ( $f = 24$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Clerical Work had 78.95% ( $f = 15$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Community Engagement had 72.72% ( $f = 8$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Competitive Student Events had 100.00% ( $f = 6$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Fundraising had 100.00% ( $f = 2$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Hospitality had 0.00% ( $f = 0$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Student Conventions, Conferences, and Camps had 80.00% ( $f = 4$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Student Recognition had 100.00% ( $f = 3$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Student Relations had 33.33% ( $f = 1$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Student Transportation had 100.00% ( $f = 2$ ) of its tasks reach consensus. Supervised Agricultural Experiences had 40.00% ( $f = 2$ ) of its tasks reach consensus.

### Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Three overarching themes emerged from tasks identified in association with a SBAE teacher's role as FFA advisor. First, SBAE teachers are competitive in FFA events. Competition in CDEs, LDEs, Agriscience Fair, and public speaking drives many of the tasks related to FFA advisement. Teachers instruct and prepare students for these activities to provide opportunities for student success and recognition. This conclusion is supported by themes such as Awards and Applications; Competitive Student Events; Student Recognition; and Student Conventions, Camps, and Conferences. Tasks supporting this conclusion included: (a) motivating students to apply for awards; (b) assisting students in developing degree, star, and proficiency applications; (c) preparing for and assessing student skill development in CDEs, LDEs, speaking, and agriscience fair events; (d) attending FFA convention; and (e) facilitating award recognition for student success. This aligns with Jones' and Edwards' (2019) description of the role of competition in

SBAE. SBAE teachers' involvement in competitive events may stem from their own positive experiences in these events as students.

Second, SBAE teachers manage administrative tasks related to FFA activities. These tasks most likely enhance students' learning experiences and promote positive experiences with FFA opportunities (Rose et al., 2016). Findings supporting this conclusion included tasks related to clerical work such as completing required paperwork for student travel to events, planning chapter trips, purchasing supplies for chapter events, and submitting student contest materials as well as tasks related to fundraising such as managing and raising chapter funds. This conclusion supports the findings of Torres et al. (2008) who found that teachers spent 8% of their time on administrative tasks.

Third, SBAE teachers engage the local communities with their FFA chapters. This engagement includes working with local organizations and initiatives as well as involving the community in chapter activities. Tasks related to community engagement included communicating with FFA alumni and supporters, establishing program culture and fostering connections in the community, and managing alumni relations. This conclusion supports the claim of Sherman and Sorensen (2020) that students' educational opportunities are enhanced through exposure to an external support system such as what their local communities may offer. It is possible local factors including the openness of community members to volunteer with their SBAE programs greatly impact the extent students benefit from these engagements.

Although these findings are of importance in describing the workload of SBAE teachers, it also is important to note that 19 tasks failed to reach agreement among the Delphi panelists. These include: (a) apply for national FFA service-learning grants, (b) attend FFA student conferences (i.e., WLC, COLT, MFE, ALD, and New Century Farmer), (c) complete entries for livestock exhibition, (d) complete nominations for livestock exhibition, (e) cook food for FFA events, (f) coordinate chapter chaos, (g) delegate program management to alumni, (h) develop chapter newsletter, (i) develop chapter program of activities, (j) establish a charter for the FFA chapter, (k) host FFA contests, (l) judge FFA contests, (m) manage students' livestock projects, (n) plan fall community gatherings, (o) serve as counselor for FFA chapter members, (p) serve as FFA advisor above chapter level, (q) serve as parent for FFA chapter members, (r) supervise students at livestock shows, and (s) volunteer for community service activities. We recognize that the needs of SBAE programs differ by location (Roberts & Dyer, 2004; Washburn et al., 2001). However, the list of items that failed to reach consensus of agreement among the Delphi panelists offers insight regarding areas for which the profession may consider reducing the expectations placed on SBAE teachers (Traini et al., 2021). Such lessening of expectations could provide teachers some respite concerning their workloads and potentially reduce SBAE teacher stress (Theiman et al., 2012) and burnout (Kitchel et al., 2012).

This study was limited to expert panelists who had taught SBAE for a minimum of three years and were actively seeking a terminal, doctoral degree in agricultural education. As such, generalization of the findings is cautioned. Instead, this research is the first step to a line of inquiry important to determining the specific human capital (Smylie, 1996) required of SBAE teachers. We recommend using the findings of this study to validate an instrument to assess teacher effectiveness, wellbeing, and fit in their careers in the context of tasks related to advising an FFA chapter. We, therefore, suggest that our findings undergo rigorous factor analyses to create a tighter and more condensed list of items in the form of an instrument. Once completed and validated, the study should be replicated with a larger participant size and broader scope. Such replication could occur on a statewide basis, regionally, or even nationally. The eventual instrument may have utility for comparing SBAE teachers across all career stages, i.e., early-, mid-, and late-career, to determine which tasks are most important and where teachers perceive they are most and least competent. Then, based on the analyses, appropriate and targeted professional development could occur. Regarding comparisons, correlational analyses should be conducted with SBAE teachers according to varying levels of their FFA involvements and achievements as advisors. For instance, SBAE teachers who have trained multiple national champion CDE teams could be compared with those who have not. In

addition, teachers recognized as advising outstanding FFA chapters could be compared to those who have not received such recognition. These types of studies have the potential to inform state leaders of appropriate professional development for in-service teachers related to FFA advisement, including the advantages and disadvantages associated with highly successful advisement activities.

In addition, a similar study should be conducted with preservice SBAE teachers to determine the specific job tasks for which they are competent and the tasks for which they need additional support as it relates to FFA advisement prior to entering the teaching profession. Studies should be replicated within and across all states as expectations associated with FFA advising may vary among states and even within states. Our findings may better inform potential teachers of the FFA advisement tasks expected of them when entering the profession, which might allow aspiring teachers to better determine if the profession is the right fit for them. As such, we recommend additional research ensue regarding the person-environment fit regarding the expectations of tasks associated with FFA advisement found in this study. Using these tasks might help aspiring teachers understand and respond to communities' expectations regarding their FFA chapters, which could further assist novices in making decisions regarding their fit.

Regarding practice, we recommend that teacher preparation programs assess the tasks required of SBAE teachers in FFA advisement to guide curriculum alignment and instructional approaches to better develop the sector-specific skills (Smith, 2010) of preservice SBAE teachers. We also recommend that teacher preparation programs evaluate their courses and include FFA advisement tasks found in this study in their curricula. Informing preservice teachers of the specific tasks associated with FFA advisement will help them better prepare for their clinical teaching experiences and may motivate these individuals to acquire the knowledge and skills required to accomplish such tasks. Our findings can also better inform decision makers of potential professional development topics related to FFA advisement for teachers of all experience levels.

### References

- Autor, D. H., & Handel, M. J. (2013). Putting tasks to the test: Human capital, job tasks, and wages. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 31(2), 59–96. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669332>
- Autor, D. H., Frank, L., & Richard, J. M. (2003). The skill content of recent technological change: An empirical investigation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118, 1279–1333. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w8337>
- Barrios, M., Guilera, G., Nuño, L., & Gómez-Benito, J. (2021). Consensus in the Delphi method: What makes a decision change? *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 163, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120484>
- Becker, G. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Best, R. W., Robinson, J. S., Terry, R., Jr., Edwards, M. C., & Cole, K. L. (2024, May 20–23). *Tasks associated with teaching school-based agricultural education: Advising an FFA chapter* [Paper presentation]. 2024 American Association for Agricultural Education National Research Conference, Manhattan, KS, United States. [https://aaea.wildapricot.org/resources/Documents/2024\\_AAEE\\_ResearchPaperProceedings.pdf](https://aaea.wildapricot.org/resources/Documents/2024_AAEE_ResearchPaperProceedings.pdf)
- Best, R. W., Robinson, J. S., Edwards, M. C., Terry, R., Jr., & Cole, K. L. (2025a). Classroom and laboratory instructional tasks associated with teaching school-based agricultural

- education. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 66(1), Article 28.  
<https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.v66i1.2916>
- Best, R. W., Campbell, J. T., Edwards, M. C., & Cline, L. L. (2025b). An overview of the Delphi method's origin, modifications, and use to augment instrument development and data collection: A research note. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, 32(1), Article 10.  
<https://doi.org/10.4148/2831-5960.1497>
- Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2007). Problems faced by high school agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 48(2), 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2007.02036>
- Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2009). An assessment of problems faced by high school agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 50(1), 21–32.  
<https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2009.01021>
- Brady, S. (2015). Utilizing and adapting the Delphi method for use in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14(5), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915621381>
- Buriak, P., & Shinn, G. C. (1989). Mission, initiatives, and obstacles to research in agricultural education: A national Delphi using external decision-makers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 30(4), 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.1989.04014>
- Chenevey, J. L., Ewing, J. C., & Whittington, M. S. (2008). Teacher burnout and job satisfaction among agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 49(3), 12–22.  
<https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2008.03012>
- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Croom, D. B. (2008). The development of the integrated three-component model of agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 49(1), 110–120.  
<https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2008.01110>
- Dalkey, N. C., Rourke, D. L., Lewis, R., & Snyder, D. (1972). *Studies in the quality of life*. Lexington Books.
- Diamond, I. R., Grant, R. C., Feldman, B. M., Pencharz, P. B., Ling, S. C., Moore, A. M., & Wales, P. W. (2014). Defining consensus: A systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 67(4), 401–409.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.12.002>
- DiBenedetto, C. A., Willis, V. C., & Barrick, R. K. (2018). Needs assessments for school-based agricultural education teachers: A review of literature. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 59(4), 52–71. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2018.04052>
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Doss, W., & Rayfield, J. (2021). The importance of FFA and SAE activities: A comparison of Texas principals' and teachers' perceptions. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 62(4), 125–138.  
<https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2021.04125>

- Eck, C. J., Robinson, J. S., Ramsey, J. W., & Cole, K. L. (2019). Identifying the characteristics of an effective agricultural education teacher: A national study. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 60*(4), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2019.04001>
- Garland, H. (1985). A cognitive meditation theory of task goals and human performance. *Motivation and Emotion, 9*(4), 345–367. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992205>
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and research* (8th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Gibbons, R., & Waldman, M. (2004). Task-specific human capital. *American Economic Review, 94*(2), 203–207. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828041301579>
- Haddad, B., Traini, H. Q., & McKim, A. J. (2023). We've crossed a line: A philosophical examination of systemic implications surrounding SBAE teachers' attempts at boundary setting. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 64*(1), 82–95. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.v64i1.31>
- Heckman, J. L. (2000). *Invest in the very young*. Ounce of Prevention Fund. <https://www.impactforequity.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Heckman-Invest-In-Very-Young.pdf>
- Hsu, C. C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 12*, Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.7275/pdz9-th90>
- Hughes, M., & Barrick, K. B. (1993). A model for agricultural education in public schools. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 34*(3), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.1993.03059>
- 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 <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2019.01109>
- Kitchel, T., Smith, A. R., Ball, A. L., Robinson, J. S., Lawver, R. G., Park, T. D., & Schell, A. (2012). Teacher job satisfaction and burnout viewed through social comparisons. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 53*(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2012.01031>
- Lemons, L. L., Brashears, T. M., Burris, S., Meyers, C., & Price, M. A. (2015). Factors contributing to attrition as reported by leavers of secondary agriculture programs. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 56*(4), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2015.04017>
- Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *The Academy of Management Review, 24*(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259035>
- Lewin, K. (1951). Intention, will and need. In D. Rapaport, *Organization and pathology of thought: Selected sources* (pp. 95–153). Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10584-005>
- Little, A. W. (2003). Motivating learning and the development of human capital. *British Association for International and Comparative Education, 33*(4), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305792032000127748>

- McKim, A. J., & Velez, J. J. (2016). An evaluation of the self-efficacy theory in agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 57*(1), 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2016.01073>
- Murray, K., Flowers, J., Croom, B., & Wilson, B. (2011). The agricultural teacher's struggle for balance between career and family. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 52*(2), 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2011.02107>
- National FFA Organization (2023a). *Agricultural education*. <https://www.ffa.org/agricultural-education/>
- National FFA Organization (2023b). *Official FFA student handbook: The member's guide to FFA information and involvement* (17th ed.). Author. <https://ffa.app.box.com/file/998247434522>
- Newcomb, L. H., McCracken, J. D., Warmbrod, J. R., & Whittington, M. S. (2025). *Methods of teaching agriculture* (3rd ed.). Virginia Tech University. <https://doi.org/10.21061/methodsofteachingagriculture>
- Park, T. D., & Dyer, J. E. (2005). Contributions of agricultural education, FFA, and 4-H to student leadership in agricultural colleges. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 46*(2), 83–95. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2005.02083>
- Phipps, L. J., Osborne, E. W., Dyer, J. E., & Ball, A. (2008). *Handbook on agricultural education in public schools* (6th ed.). Thomson Delmar Learning.
- Roberts, R., Wittie, B. M., Stair, K. S., Blackburn, J. J., & Smith, H. E. (2020). The dimensions of professional development needs for secondary agricultural education teachers across career stages: A multiple case study comparison. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 61*(3), 128–143. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2020.03128>
- Roberts, T. G., & Dyer, J. E. (2004). Characteristics of effective agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 45*(4), 82–95. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2004.04082>
- Robinson, J. S., & Baker, M. A. (2013). The effect of human capital on principals' decisions to interview candidates in agricultural education: Implications for pre-service teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 54*(1), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2013.01139>
- Rose, C., Stephens, C. A., Stripling, C., Cross, T., Sanok, D. E., & Brawner, S. (2016). The benefits of FFA membership as part of agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 57*(2), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2016.02033>
- Sackman, H. (1974). *Delphi assessment: Expert opinion, forecasting, and group process*. RAND Corporation. <https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reports/2006/R1283.pdf>
- Schultz, T. W. (1971). *Investment in human capital: The role of education and of research*. The Free Press.
- Sherman, A., & Sorensen, T. J. (2020). A national examination of the predictors of volunteer utilization in school-based agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 61*(2), 339–357. <https://doi.org/10.502/jae.2020.02339>

- Smalley, S. W., & Rank, B. D. (2019). Preservice teacher perceptions of the role of an agriculture teacher during their early field experience. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 60*(2), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2019.02099>
- Smith, E. (2010). Sector-specific human capital and the distribution of earnings. *Journal of Human Capital, 4*(1), 35–61. <https://doi.org/10.1086/655467>
- Smylie, M. A. (1996). From bureaucratic control to building human capital: The importance of teacher learning in education reform. *Educational Researcher, 25*(9), 9–11. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X025009009>
- Solomonson, J. K., & Retallick, M. S. (2018). Over the edge: Factors nudging mid-career, school-based agriculture teachers out of the profession. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 59*(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2018.04001>
- Sorensen, T. J., & McKim, A. J. (2014). Perceived work-life balance ability, job satisfaction, and professional commitment among agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 55*(4), 116–132. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2014.04116>
- Sorensen, T. J., McKim, A. J., & Velez, J. J. (2016). A national study of work-family balance and job satisfaction among agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 57*(4), 146–159. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2016.04146>
- Stitt-Gohdes, W. L., & Crews, T. B. (2004). The Delphi technique: A research strategy for career and technical education. *Journal of Career and Technical Education, 20*(2), 55–67. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1069510.pdf>
- Talbert, B. A., Croom, B., LaRose, S. E., Vaughn, R., & Lee, J. S. (2022). *Foundations of agricultural education* (4th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Terry, R., Jr., & Briers, G. E. (2010). Roles of the secondary agriculture teacher. In R. M. Torres, T. Kitchel, & A. L. Ball (Eds.), *Preparing and advancing teachers in agricultural education* (pp. 86–99). The Ohio State University Curriculum Materials Service.
- Thieman, E. B., Henry, A. L., & Kitchel, T. (2012). Resilient agricultural educators: Taking stress to the next level. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 53*(1), 81–94. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2012.01081>
- Torres, R. M., Lawver, R. G., & Lambert, M. D. (2009). Job related stress among secondary agricultural education teachers: A comparison study. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 50*(3), 100–111. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2009.03100>
- Torres, R. M., Ulmer, J. D., & Aschenbrener, M. S. (2008). Workload distribution among agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 49*(2), 75–87. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2008.02075>
- Traini, H. Q., Haddad, B., Stewart, J., & Velez, J. J. (2021). Adjusting, appeasing, and rearranging: How agriculture teachers reconcile the demands of the profession. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 62*(2), 167–184. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2021.02167>
- Washburn, S. G., King, B. O., Garton, B. L., & Harbstreet, S. R. (2001, December 12). *A comparison of the professional development needs of Kansas and Missouri teachers of agriculture* [Paper

presentation]. Proceedings of the 28th Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference, New Orleans, LA.  
<http://aaaeonline.org/Resources/Documents/National/ResearchProceedings,%20National2001.pdf>