

A HISTORY OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE INSTRUCTION AND AND EVENTS IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AND FFA

James J. Connors, Assistant Professor
The Ohio State University

Abstract

Leadership development, parliamentary procedure and agricultural education/FFA have been closely related for over 75 years. This historical research study investigated the history of parliamentary procedure instruction, the use of parliamentary procedure to develop the leadership skills of FFA members, research related to parliamentary procedure, and the establishment of a national FFA competitive event in parliamentary procedure. The study found evidence that the curricula of some secondary agricultural education programs included parliamentary procedure in the early part of the 1900s. FFA members, advisors, national FFA officers, the National FFA Alumni Association, and the National Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association all played a part in promoting the establishment of a national competitive event in parliamentary procedure.

Introduction

The use of parliamentary procedure in agricultural education and the Future Farmers of America goes back to the very beginning of formal instruction in agriculture. Even before the FFA was founded in 1928, agricultural education students were being taught the principles of parliamentary procedure in agricultural education classes. Teaching of parliamentary procedure was already being conducted in 1906 at the New York State School of Agriculture located at the St. Lawrence University at Canton. The two year vocational course in agriculture included instruction in parliamentary law (Stimson & Lathrop, 1942). Parliamentary procedure played a vital role from the very beginning of the Future Farmers of America. Delegates who attended the first National Agricultural Education Congress in Kansas City, Missouri in 1928 used parliamentary procedure to reach key decisions which would forever effect agricultural education and the FFA organization (Future Farmers of America, 1956; Teeney, 1977).

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to document the history of leadership development through the use of parliamentary procedure instruction and events in agricultural education and the Future Farmers of America organization. The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Identify the initial relationship between agricultural education programs, the FFA organization, and instruction in leadership development and parliamentary procedure.
2. Document the incorporation of parliamentary procedure instruction into secondary agricultural education courses and FFA chapter activities.
3. Document the organizations and individuals who were responsible for the establishment of the National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Career Development Event.

Methods and Procedures

Historical research methods were used to accomplish the objectives of the study (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Borg and Gall (1983) stated that

“historical research involves the systematic search for documents and other sources that contain facts relating to the historian’s questions about the past. By studying the past, the educational historian hopes to achieve better understanding of present institutions, practices, and problems in education” (p. 800).

Data was gathered through research at several land-grant university libraries, at the National FFA Archives at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, and personal communications with eyewitnesses. Whenever possible, the researcher utilized primary sources of information. Primary sources utilized in this study included proceedings of FFA conventions, minutes of FFA Board of Directors meetings, articles in *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, research studies, and personal communications with eyewitnesses. Secondary sources of information included books, FFA proceedings, and articles from *The Agricultural Education Magazine*.

The researcher exposed all documents to internal and external criticism. External criticism was established by the researcher by reviewing each document to determine who wrote it, if it was an original document, and if it was a genuine representation of the events that transpired. The documents also were examined for internal criticism to evaluate the accuracy and worth of the statements for addressing the objectives of the study.

Trustworthiness of the results were established following the criteria established by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Multiple sources such as meeting minutes, books, articles, and personal interviews were used to triangulate the data gathered and establish credibility of the results. Transferability of the results was established by providing

readers with a detailed description of the data sources used to reach the results and draw conclusions for the study. Dependability of the results can be established by following the methodology used in the study. The researcher kept detailed records including photocopies of all documents, books, articles, etc. utilized during the data collection process. Confirmability of the results is addressed by the inclusion of quotations from books, articles, meeting minutes, along with quantitative results from research studies related to parliamentary procedure. All data collected supports the conclusions and interpretations drawn by the researcher. One threat to the neutrality of this research is the self acknowledged bias of the researcher towards the leadership development benefits of parliamentary procedure. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described neutrality as “the degree to which the findings of an inquiry are determined by the subjects (respondents) and conditions of the inquiry and not by the biases, motivations, interests, or perspectives of the inquirer” (p. 290). The researcher made every effort to establish the trustworthiness of the results and control the threat from researcher bias.

Results

Leadership development through parliamentary procedure

Leadership development and instruction in parliamentary procedure have been closely related since the beginning of agricultural education and the FFA organization. From the very beginning of the Future Farmers of America in 1928, newly elected national FFA officers were provided with copies of Howe’s Parliamentary Procedure manual immediately after taking office (Future Farmers of America, 1932). The minutes of the November 1932 FFA Advisory Committee explicitly stated that “The new national officers should start immediately to study parliamentary procedure and continue this study throughout the year in order to be ready to handle the Sixth National Convention” (Future Farmers of America, 1932, p. 2).

As the young organization grew, parliamentary procedure started to play an increasingly important role in the leadership development of agriculture students and FFA members. During the eighth National FFA Convention in 1935, the Plain Dealing FFA chapter, from Louisiana, presented a demonstration parliamentary procedure contest to the delegates (Future Farmers of America, 1935). An article in the *History of Agricultural Education of Less Than College Grade in the United States* (Stimson & Lathrop, 1942) also discussed the Plain Dealing parliamentary demonstration team when it was written:

Parliamentary procedure is another way of aiding in the development of competent and aggressive rural leadership. Knowledge of parliamentary procedure is needed by everyone. Besides its common use in all types of meetings, it teaches organization, cooperation, discipline, quick thinking, and good citizenship. The Plain Dealing chapter demonstrated parliamentary procedure activities at the National F.F.A. Convention in Kansas City in 1936. (p. 166).

Another reference to parliamentary procedure was contained in a document titled: *Interpretations of Minimum Qualification Requirements for the American Farmer Degree* (National Advisory Council, 1941). This document stated that “a candidate must show outstanding ability in leadership and cooperation.” It stated that a candidate for the American Farmer Degree would not have shown outstanding ability in leadership unless he

“has participated in and been declared a first place individual or member of a winning team in some local county, district, area, or State contest that is recognized as a bona fide vocational agriculture contest such as public speaking, parliamentary procedure...” (p. 5).

Numerous pieces of evidence exist to show the prevalence of parliamentary procedure instruction, demonstrations, and contests through the years. Robinson (1944) and Stewart (1951) reported the existence of a Chapter Procedure Contest in Ohio sponsored by the Townshend Agricultural Education Society at The Ohio State University. In 1945, Robert Zinn described the relationship between parliamentary procedure and the FFA when he wrote:

Before the time that F.F.A. chapters started their systematic study of the *Rules of Order*, very little, if any, serious instruction was given to young people in parliamentary law...What can be done to give our F.F.A. members greater opportunity to develop adequate parliamentary ability? It seems to me that one of the most worthwhile means to this end is the use of parliamentary procedure contests. (p. 116).

Over the years, parliamentary procedure continued to be an important component of local, state and national FFA activities. During the decades between 1940 and 1970, state FFA associations increased their emphasis on parliamentary procedure by starting statewide parliamentary procedure contests (Graham & Strubinger, 1940; Lofton, 1948; McMillen, 1948; Kelly, 1948).

The use of parliamentary procedure to develop the leadership skills of FFA members and officers has been espoused by numerous agricultural professionals for decades. Cook (1947) in his book *A Handbook on Teaching Vocational Agriculture* discussed the development of leadership skills through the use of parliamentary procedure in FFA chapter meetings and contests. In later editions of the handbook (Phipps & Cook, 1956; Phipps, 1980) the authors warned readers about the improper use of parliamentary procedure when they stated:

Boys should know how to use the basic principles of parliamentary procedure when they are needed...

Unnecessary use of parliamentary procedure may hinder group processes instead of aiding progress. FFA members usually learn through participation in their chapters how to use essential parliamentary procedure, but they also need to learn that parliamentary procedure is not used in meetings to confuse others, in order to prevent the will of a group from prevailing, or in order to obtain special privileges...Misuse or overuse of parliamentary procedure may cause a chapter to disintegrate or become inactive, and it often causes disagreements in a school... (Phipps & Cook, 1956, p. 366).

In the book *A More Effective FFA*, Wall (1960) also discussed the consequences of misusing parliamentary procedure. He wrote: "Chapter members will learn to use correct parliamentary procedure by using it in their chapter meetings and committee meetings...Chapter members do not necessarily need to become skilled parliamentarians. Too much parliamentary wrangling tends to demoralize chapter meetings" (p. 163).

Parliamentary procedure instruction in agricultural education

An agricultural teacher from Dadeville, Missouri wrote "My favorite method of developing leadership in vocational agricultural students is through teaching parliamentary procedure" (Hankins, 1952, p. 132). Ziegler (1955) wrote in *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, "FFA parliamentary training is providing that step in many communities in Washington today. Future Farmers are putting on parliamentary drills or demonstrations for keenly interested members of Granges, Farm Bureaus, P.T.A., and other groups" (p. 134). Ziegler estimated that most of the 143 chapters in Washington state entered preliminary contests at the district, sub-state and final state championship events. He stated that "scattered contests have been held throughout the State for many years but it was only nine years ago that they were started on a statewide basis" (p. 134).

The Proceedings of the 28th National Convention - October 10-13, 1955 (Future Farmers of America, 1955), under the Program of Activities section on leadership, addressed the importance of parliamentary procedure for local FFA chapters. The national organization outlined the importance of local chapters including parliamentary procedure in their local programs of activities with the goal of conducting chapter meetings according to parliamentary procedure. Suggested ways of accomplishing this was through training, contests, parliamentary procedure books, and electing a chapter parliamentarian.

In 1957, Cornell reported the existence of a Chapter Meeting Contest in New York state. Cornell wrote, "I refer especially to the Chapter Meeting Contest as an opportunity for every Chapter member to participate in one of the outstanding leadership training activities of the FFA" (p. 181). Ernest Muncrief, an agriculture teacher from Marlow, Oklahoma, saw the benefits of FFA members learning parliamentary procedure when he stated, "...the most important item in connection with the study of parliamentary practices comes in the improvement of the local chapter meetings" (1959, p. 206).

Newcomb, McCracken, and Warmbrod (1993) in their book *Methods of Teaching Agriculture* described the use of parliamentary procedure when they stated,

Another important area for leadership development is the area of learning how to conduct meetings. Most of the organized classroom instruction for this occurs through learning parliamentary procedure. This is practiced in class, but the more meaningful practice comes in chapter meetings, in committee meetings, and through parliamentary procedure contests. (p. 249)

In the book *The FFA and You*, Bender, Taylor, Hansen and Newcomb (1979) wrote,

"Many chapter advisors have found that one of the best ways to learn the essentials of correct parliamentary procedure is to include

it in the classroom instruction... Demonstrations may be arranged for high school assemblies or at meetings of other organizations” (p. 441). The authors also discussed the contribution of parliamentary procedure contests for increasing members’ parliamentary procedure abilities.

Research on Parliamentary Procedure

In 1951, Stewart reported the results of a study he conducted with boys who had participated on Chapter Procedure Teams in Ohio. The study asked the boys to rate eight benefits as either a 1 - superior benefit, 2 - average benefit, or 3 - minor benefit of participation. The item rated as a superior benefit most often was “The ability to participate correctly in business meetings.” Another research study on parliamentary procedure was conducted by Cardozier in 1964. Cardozier wrote that “A study, conducted several years ago by this writer, raised serious doubt as to the values being generated in vocational agriculture pupils by the study of parliamentary procedure” (p. 88). Cardozier stated, “Few would question the fact that former FFA members usually know parliamentary procedure better than most other members of groups. Through the use of their knowledge of parliamentary procedure, they are often virtually able to control meetings” (p. 88). He also concluded that “there were no significant differences in attitudes toward democracy between pupils who had studied parliamentary procedure in vocational agriculture and an equal group of pupils in each of eight schools who had not studied parliamentary procedure” (p. 88).

Stewart, Smith, Ehlert, and Milhalevich (1985) studied FFA members’, officers’, and advisors’ perceptions of FFA organizational goals and activities. The researchers found that four items related to conduct of meetings: using parliamentary procedure, planning and conducting meetings, and speaking effectively in front of a group had an estimated cluster reliability of .80 and high factor loading for attaining the goals of the activity. Although, the researchers did report that “the findings also indicated that

the benefits of FFA membership were perceived to be differentially distributed, with officers realizing greater achievement” (p. 54).

Brannon, Holley, and Key (1989) conducted research on the impact of vocational agriculture and the FFA on community leadership. The researchers found that of those community leaders who had been members of the FFA organization, 58% had participated in parliamentary procedure activities. When asked the extent to which FFA activities contributed to their leadership development (1 = *None* to 5 = *Great*), a large majority of respondents indicated that the FFA had contributed “much” to teaching them how to participate in and conduct meetings ($M = 3.93$), the highest rated of 11 areas.

Calls for a National Parliamentary Procedure Contest

As membership in the Future Farmers of America reached its peak in the late 1970s, there was a new call for a parliamentary procedure contest on the national level. In the fall of 1978, the Carthage FFA chapter, Carthage, Missouri, established the National Invitational Parliamentary Law Contest. The contest was an invitational event where the state winning parliamentary procedure teams from across the country were invited to participate. The first contest included six teams. The Carthage event averaged 20 teams per year (National FFA, 1991a). During the 13 years between 1978 and 1990, 1,348 FFA members from 194 chapters in 34 states participated in the Parliamentary Law Contest and were guests of the Carthage FFA.

At the November 1979 National FFA Convention (Future Farmers of America, 1979). the delegate committee on contests drafted a recommendation that a committee be implemented for the purpose of investigating the feasibility and acceptance of a national parliamentary procedure contest. The committee stated that the rationale for a national contest was that parliamentary procedure was a basic fundamental skill of the organization thus, skills needed to be improved and state winners needed a chance to continue on to a higher objective.

Only two months later, the National FFA Board of Directors would reach a decision that would have a significant effect on parliamentary procedure on the national level. The Board of Directors discussed a National Parliamentary Procedure Contest Proposal. The minutes of the January 1980 Board of Directors meeting state,

“It was recommended to the Board of Directors that only those contests listed in Bulletin #4 and held at the National Convention be recognized as an Official National FFA Contest. This is to be communicated to all states by the National Advisor” (Future Farmers of America, 1980).

This recommendation, as approved, was probably initiated as a result of the Carthage FFA Chapter in Carthage, Missouri starting its National Invitational Parliamentary Law Contest and their desire to see a national FFA contest in parliamentary procedure.

There did seem to be a growing desire for a national contest to teach parliamentary procedure skills. At the November 1983 Board of Directors meeting, held just prior to the National FFA Convention, the topic of a national contest was addressed once again (Future Farmers of America, 1983). In their final report to the Board of Directors, the 1982-83 National FFA Officers suggested that the Board, “Strongly look at the implementation of a group of contests that develop competencies and proficiencies in the areas of parliamentary procedure, dairy and poultry” (p. 2).

Over the course of the next year, the National Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association (NVATA) got involved in the debate. At the FFA Board of Directors meeting in January 1985, NVATA President Thompson reviewed items of concern that were discussed at the NVATA meeting in December 1984 in New Orleans, Louisiana. Mr. Thompson’s report stated that “the National FFA Board be made aware of the NVATA’s continuing support of a National Parliamentary Contest” (Future Farmers of America, 1985a). Mr. Thompson went on to state that there was an NVATA committee working on this topic and will meet in the spring [1985].

As a probable result of these initiatives, a task force was finally appointed in 1985. A National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Study Committee met on July 2-3, 1985 in Kansas City, Missouri (Future Farmers of America, 1985b; Marion Fletcher, personal communication, October 31, 2002). Prior to the study committee meeting, a nationwide survey on the need for a national parliamentary procedure contest was sent to all State FFA Advisors and Executive Secretaries. The study committee received responses from 36 states. The reasons given for establishing a contest included allowing FFA members to be involved in the National Convention, provide additional recognition for state associations, local chapters and individual members, uniformity in state contests, motivation for increased chapter participation in parliamentary procedure activities, and increased incentive for individuals (students) to learn Parliamentary Procedure.

Reasons against a national parliamentary procedure activity included adequate proficiency in parliamentary procedure can be developed at the state level, parliamentary procedure contests above the state level would become more theatrical or canned, and the increased pressure on states to participate because there is a National Contest (activity) as well as the additional costs incurred by state associations, chapters, and individuals participating in a national activity.

When asked if they support the addition of a National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Contest the respondents were evenly split, 18 responded “yes,” and 17 responded “no.” Some of the comments written by respondents included (p. 3):

“I am opposed to proliferating national contests - this activity is not closely related to the idea of integral to instruction.”

“Parliamentary Procedure has been an integral part of vo-ag curriculum and an outlet for recognition should be provided above the state level.”

“I see no educational benefit in a parliamentary procedure contest beyond the state level.”

As a result of the survey, the study committee voted 6-2 not to establish a National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Contest and recommended that the Carthage FFA Chapter, its advisors, members and the Alumni affiliate be commended for initiating and sponsoring a National Parliamentary Law Contest and urged the chapter to continue this invitational activity.

The study and recommendations were discussed by the Board at its July 1985 board meeting (Future Farmers of America, 1985b). Walt Schuh, President, NVATA, pointed out that the NVATA passed a resolution in support of a National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Contest (personal communication, October 29, 2002). It was moved by National FFA Officer Mike Barrett and carried to commend the Carthage, Missouri FFA Chapter, its advisors, members and FFA Alumni affiliate for initiating and sponsoring a National Parliamentary Law Contest and urge the chapter to continue this invitational activity.

The issue of a national parliamentary procedure contest resurfaced at the July 1987 FFA Board of Directors Meeting. During the meeting,

“Mr. Reese asked permission of the Board for the Alumni Council to conduct inquiry into the feasibility of the Council managing a national invitational parliamentary procedure contest when the Carthage, Missouri, sponsors choose to stop featuring this event (which he understood would be this year). Considerable discussion ensued” (Future Farmers of America, 1987, p. 16).

It was moved by National FFA Officer Jayme Feary that the National Board of Directors go on record to congratulate the FFA Alumni for showing interest in conducting an independent invitational national Parliamentary Procedure Contest not at all included and associated with the National FFA Organization’s contests and awards programs. However the motion failed (Future Farmers of America, 1987).

After many decades of discussing and studying the issue of a national FFA

parliamentary procedure contest, the FFA Board of Directors took action in 1991. During their January 1991 board meeting it was moved by National FFA Officer Julie Classen and carried that a national taskforce of National FFA Officers, NVATA, AAAE, or NASAE members be established to develop the objectives, skills, competencies and format for a National FFA Parliamentary Law Contest. This taskforce was to report back to the Contest and Awards Committee at the July 1991 Board of Directors Meeting. (National FFA Organization, 1991b, p. 10)

Finally, a motion introduced by National FFA Officer Danny Grellner proposed creating a National FFA Parliamentary Law contest. The board minutes read, “It was moved by Danny Grellner and carried to establish a National FFA Parliamentary Law contest” (National FFA Organization, 1991b, p. 10)

The National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Task Force reported back to the board at their June 1991 meeting. The minutes report that, “It was moved by Danny Grellner (Jamie Cano) and carried to change the name of the National FFA Parliamentary Law Contest to National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Contest as recommended by the National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Task Force” (National FFA Organization, 1991c, p. 9; Jamie Cano, personal communication, November 22, 2002). After the field test in 1991, the official event started at the 1992 National FFA Convention.

Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications

The history of leadership development through parliamentary procedure in agricultural education and the FFA organization is long and complicated. For decades, secondary agriculture teachers utilized parliamentary procedure to improve the operation of their FFA chapters, increase the leadership of their chapter officers and help FFA members to become better citizens who were actively involved in their communities.

Various research studies have shown the leadership benefits of learning and using

parliamentary procedure. However, some scholars were concerned about individuals knowledgeable about parliamentary procedure using it for inappropriate purposes during meetings. Although, while this concern was expressed, it seems to be based on anecdotal evidence only and not supported by valid evidence.

Even though research found that parliamentary procedure was being taught in agricultural education long before the founding of the FFA, it took over 60 years for the National FFA Organization to establish a competitive event in parliamentary procedure. While there were numerous calls for a national contest over the years, it took on renewed emphasis during the 1980s. This was primarily as a result of the Carthage FFA establishing the National Invitational Parliamentary Law Contest. The success of this initiative, by a local FFA chapter, did not go unnoticed by the National FFA Organization.

The National FFA Organization was not quick to establish a national contest in parliamentary procedure. For many years, agriculture teachers, state supervisors, NVATA officers, National FFA Officers, and a special Task Force all debated the issue. It was only after this prolonged debate, and the imminent end to the National Invitational Parliamentary Law Contest in Carthage, Missouri, that a motion passed to establish a National FFA Parliamentary Procedure Contest.

Throughout the 1990s, an increasing number of states sent teams to participate in the national event and revised their state contest formats to reflect the national event. The national event quickly became the largest career development event with 43 teams consisting of 258 FFA members participating in the 2002 event (National FFA Organization, 2002). The beginning of the National FFA contest only served to improve the awareness of parliamentary procedure by FFA members, advisors, parents and alumni. The success of the national event has led to the establishment of a Parliamentary Procedure Contest held at the *Big E* Agricultural Exhibition in Massachusetts each September (Janet Rosequist, personal communication, October 31, 2002). In addition, a new

organization titled the *Society for Agricultural Education Parliamentarians* was recently formed to further promote parliamentary procedure instruction in agricultural education.

Secondary agricultural education instructors should be encouraged to utilize parliamentary procedure to improve leadership development in their agriculture programs and FFA chapters. New instructional materials for incorporating parliamentary procedure instruction into agricultural education curriculum are needed. The National FFA and the National Association for Agricultural Educators (NAAE) should also work closely to promote the use and instruction of parliamentary procedure in secondary agriculture programs.

The relationship of parliamentary procedure, agricultural education and the FFA is a unique chapter in the history of agricultural education. Thousands of agriculture teachers, students, FFA members and officers have developed their leadership abilities by learning parliamentary procedure in agricultural education classes and the FFA. Evidence of the use of parliamentary procedure can be seen in the number of former FFA members who are now, or have previously, served in elected positions in local, county, state or federal governments. Agricultural education students, FFA members or officers who have learned parliamentary procedure have probably used this knowledge, skill and leadership to become active and productive members of their local communities, their state and the nation.

References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Bender, R. E., Taylor, R.E., Hansen, C. K. & Newcomb, L. H. (1979). *The FFA and You: Your guide to learning*. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Brannon, T., Holley, C. W., & Key, J. P. (1989). Impact of vocational agriculture/FFA on community leadership. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 30(3), 37-45.

Cardozier, V. R. (1964). Parliamentary law and the democratic concept. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 37(4), p. 88.

Cornell, P. (1957). "Chapter meeting" contest is effective. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 29(8), p. 181-182.

Cook, G. C. (1947). *Handbook on teaching vocational agriculture* (5th ed.). Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Future Farmers of America (1932). *Minutes November 1932 board of directors meeting*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

Future Farmers of America (1935). *Proceedings of the 8th national FFA convention*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

Future Farmers of America (1955). *Proceedings of the 28th national FFA convention - October 10-13, 1955*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

Future Farmers of America (1979). *Proceedings of the 52th national FFA convention - November 1979*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis.

Future Farmers of America (1980). *Minutes of the January 1980 board of directors meeting*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Future Farmers of America (1983). *Minutes of the November 1983 board of directors meeting*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

Future Farmers of America (1985a). *Minutes of the January 1985 board of directors meeting*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

Future Farmers of America (1985b). *Minutes of the July 1985 board of directors meeting*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

Future Farmers of America (1987). *Minutes of the July 1987 board of directors meeting*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

Graham, B. & Strubinger, H. M. (1940). Parliamentary procedure contests. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 13(6), p. 117.

Hankins, C. W. (1952). Parliamentary training develops leadership. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 25(6), p. 132 & 136.

Kelly, L. H. (1948). Michigan association F.F.A. sponsors awards program. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 20(9), p. 177.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Lofton, W. T. (1948). More about state F.F.A. conventions. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 20(11), p. 218.

McMillen, S. D. (1948). Leadership training emphasized at West Virginia F.F.A. convention. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 20(10), p. 184-185.

Muncreif, E. (1959) Training a chapter

meeting team. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 31(9), p. 206-210.

National Advisory Council (1941). *Interpretation of minimum qualification requirements for the american farmer degree contained in section E of the national FFA constitution*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

National FFA Organization (1991a). National parliamentary contest to become a reality. *FFA Times*. November 14, 1991, p. 2.

National FFA Organization (1991b). *Minutes of the January 1991 board of directors meeting*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

National FFA Organization (1991c). *Minutes of the July 1991 board of directors meeting*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

National FFA Organization (2002). *National FFA parliamentary procedure career development event final Report*. Indianapolis: Author

Newcomb, L. H., McCracken, J. D., & Warmbrod, J. R. (1993). *Methods of teaching agriculture* (2nd ed.). Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Phipps, L. J. (1980). *Handbook on agricultural education in public schools*. Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Phipps, L. J. & Cook, G. C. (1956). *Handbook on teaching vocational agriculture* (6th ed.). Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Robinson, D. B. (1944). A state contest in chapter procedure. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 16(10), p. 190.

Stewart, W. F. (1951). Benefits from parliamentary procedure contests. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 24(4), p. 85-86.

Stewart, B. R., Smith, C. L., Ehlert, M. W. & Milhalevich, J. R. (1985). Member, officer, and advisor perceptions of FFA organizational goals and activities. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture*, 26(2), 47-55, 64.

Stimson, R. W. & Lathrop, F. W. (1942). *History of agricultural education of less than college grade in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Teeney, A. W. (1977). *FFA at 50*. National FFA Archives. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis.

Wall, S. (1960). *A more effective FFA*. Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Ziegler, G. (1955). Parliamentary procedure improves public relations. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 28(6), p. 134.

Zinn, R. (1945). I rise to a point of order. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 17(6), 116-117.

JAMES J. CONNORS is an Assistant Professor in Human and Community Resource Development at The Ohio State University, 216 Agricultural Administration Building, 2120 Fyffe Road, Columbus, OH 43210. E-mail: Connors.49@osu.edu.