



Examining Prejudice Exhibited by School Based Agricultural Teachers in the Midwestern U.S.

Colby Gregg, Dr. Amanda Bowling, & Dr. Tracy Kitchel

Department of Agricultural Communication, Education, and Leadership



Introduction & Theoretical Framework

- Increasingly over the past decade, the National FFA Organization (2019) has built efforts towards fostering diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) within agricultural education.
- Some studies regarding prejudice have been documented in Ag-Ed but has primarily focused on those who *experienced* it.
 - Sexism** has decreased in severity over time, but female teachers across generations have experienced gender bias in their role as agriculture teachers (Baxter et al., 2008).
 - Racism** has been examined in FFA, with urban members stating they felt they had to reconcile with race in an event that seemed to cater to a white, rural majority (Martin & Kitchel, 2015).
 - Homophobia** has been examined in many levels and subjects and has repeatedly been cited as a reason that many LGBTQ+ teachers live 'double lives' to separate their public and private selves as form of self preservation (Bower-Phipps, 2017; Ferfolja & Hopkins, 2013; Gray, 2013; Griffin, 1992; Jackson, 2006; Mayo, Jr., 2008; Olson, 1987).
- These findings of prejudice can be examined through the integrated threat theory of prejudice, which defines four different threats that can cause prejudice (Stephan & Stephan, 2000).
- Stephan & Stephan (1993) define prejudice as negative affect, which in turn includes evaluations (disliking) and emotions (hatred).
 - Thus, we must also acknowledge that prejudice does not equate to outward behavior.

Methodology

AAAE Research Agenda Priority Area 3

Sufficient scientific and professional workforce that addresses the challenges of the 21st century (Stripling & Ricketts, 2016)

Research Objectives

- Describe levels of social desirability in the population.
- Describe levels of prejudice exhibited by the population.
- Examine if prejudice levels differ based on selected demographics.

Population

NAAE Region IV (N = 2273)



Sample

Ideal sample: n = 331 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970)

Stratified random sample based on state teacher pop.: n = 333

Instrument

- Social Desirability ($\alpha = .88$) (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972; Fischer & Fick, 1993)
- Neosexism ($\alpha = .76$) (Tougas et al., 1995)
- Modern Homophobia against Lesbians & Gay Men ($\alpha = .95$) (Raja & Stokes, 1998)
- Attitudes Toward Diversity in Coworkers ($\alpha = .78$) (Montei et al., 1996)

Validation established through a panel of experts (n = 6), all but one of whom belonged to disenfranchised groups that face the prejudices in this study.

Accepted Sample and Nonresponse

- Initial response rate of 21.6% (n = 72)
- Random resampling of 20% of nonrespondents (n = 53)
- Compared respondents to nonrespondents via independent t-tests and found one significant difference, indicating a medium nonrespondent bias in homophobia toward lesbians.

$t(121) = -2.06, p = .04, d = .37$

Results

Table 1

Participant Demographics	n %	
	n	%
Gender		
Female	68	55.7
Male	54	44.3
Community Grew Up In		
Rural (< 2,500)	82	59.4
Not Rural ($\geq 2,500$)	34	23.2
Valid Listwise	108	80

Table 2

Properties for Study Scales and Age Demographics	n M SD α			
	n	M	SD	α
Social Desirability	7	1.47	.24	.61
Neosexism	9	2.09	.57	.81
Modern Homophobia				
→ Lesbians	5	2.14	.89	.90
→ Gay Men	5	1.93	.89	.88
Racism Scale	8	1.93	.53	.81
Age		37.69	11.62	

Table 3

Multivariate Test Results	Effect Wilks' Λ F df_1 df_2 p η_p^2					
	Effect	Wilks' Λ	F	df_1	df_2	p
Gender	.894	2.997	4	101	.022	.106
Community Raised	.887	3.201	4	101	.016	.113
Both Variables	.975	.643	4	101	.633	

Note. Significant results in bold

Table 4

Source	Scale	F p η_p^2		
		F	p	η_p^2
Gender	Sexism	7.896	.006	.071
	Homophobia → Lesbians	7.91	.006	.071
	Homophobia → Gay Men	8.921	.004	.079
	Racism	.934	.336	
Community Raised	Sexism	1.835	.178	
	Homophobia → Lesbians	6.457	.013	.058
	Homophobia → Gay Men	12.052	.001	.104
	Racism	4.817	.03	.044

Note. Significant results in bold

Conclusions and Discussion

Objective 1

Social Desirability followed a normal distribution and did not correlate with any prejudice variable, indicating *results were not biased* in this way.

Objective 2

Sample means (Table 2) indicate *slight* prejudices toward women and lesbians, and *low* prejudices toward racial minorities and gay men.

Objective 3

MANOVA results (Tables 3 and 4) *show higher prejudice levels* in teachers who are male or grew up in rural communities, with no interaction effect.

Because new SBAE teachers from Region IV are overwhelmingly female (74%) and experiencing a historically high rate of retention (97%) (NAAE, 2019), it can be expected that rates of prejudice will likely decline over coming years when taking gender into account. However, no information was found exploring hometown populations of current and rising teachers. It's recommended that researchers consider adding this as a demographic question in future work. Additionally, to address the levels of prejudice present, it's recommended that SBAE state staff and teacher educators implement diversity programming for all teachers, but particularly for pre- and in-service teachers who are male or from rural settings.

References



Password: Prejudice



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF FOOD, AGRICULTURAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES