## BOYS and EDUCATION <br> Barry Chevannes

## How did we get from this...........

- Raymond Coke, "Walking Down Memory Lane" in the 2003 Buxtonian wrote the following:
- I remember on one occasion, we did not have a teacher, so a number of us boys decided to take the afternoon off and went fishing. We rode our bicycles all the way to Rockfort and had a good time. Next morning after devotions, Buxton Thompson said, 'Will the fishermen please see me in the office!' We went with fear and trepidation, but he was kind to us. He gave us a severe warning and sent us back to our class.


## ...to THIS?

- "Only thirteen years old, and calling himself 'a rude yout' who no fear no bwaai', the young leader gave us a sound lecture: School was a waste of time. Shabba Ranks, Roun' Head and a host of other DJs were not as educated as we, yet did not have to walk up and down the streets of the ghetto claiming to be researching about boys and girls.... 'Di school business,' he declared, 'is a fraud. A man 'ave fi learn to live, from people who go t'rough di rough and tough. Dat no teach iina school!'" (Learning to be a Man, p. 177).
- Meaning
- School has no meaning for Male
, By inference, School is a Female concern


## -Theory Number 1

## ,Girls Participate More than Boys

## Table 1

## Grade 1 Enrolment of 2000 Cohort by Age and Gender

| AGE | Male | Female |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | 5 | 3 |
| 5 | 421 | 403 |
| 6 | 23,372 | 22,869 |
| 7 | 4,881 | 3,403 |
| 8 | 323 | 160 |
| 9 | 49 | 15 |
| 10 | 6 | 5 |
| 11 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 24,057 | 26,860 |

## Table 2 Age 6 of the 2000 Cohort: Grades 1-6

|  | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 23,372 | 22,115 | 20,654 | 19,163 | 18,954 |
| $-/+$ |  | $-1,257$ | $-1,461$ | 1,491 | -209 |
| Females | 22,869 | 22,109 | 20,789 | 20,031 | 20,250 |
| $-/+$ |  | -760 | -1320 | -758 | +219 |

# Table 3 <br> <br> The 2000 Cohort -/+ Grades 1-6 

 <br> <br> The 2000 Cohort -/+ Grades 1-6}

|  | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | $-/+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 29,057 | 28,086 | 28,762 | 26,078 | 26,615 | $-2,442$ |
| $-/+$ |  | -571 | +676 | -2684 | +537 | $-8.0 \%$ |
| Females | 26,860 | 26,716 | 26,474 | 25,204 | 27,007 | +147 |
| -/+ |  | -144 | -242 | $-1,270$ | $+1,803$ | $+0.5 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 55,917 | 54,802 | 55,236 | 51,277 | 53,622 | $4.1 \%$ |

## Table 4

## 1995 Cohort: Grades 7-11

|  | Grade 7 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 | $-/+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 24,633 | 26,393 | 19,947 | 18,558 | -6075 |
| $-/+$ |  | $+1,760$ | $-6,446$ | 01,389 | $-24.6 \%$ |
| Females | 23,651 | 25,939 | 21,850 | 19,614 | 4,037 |
| -/+ |  | $+2,288$ | $-4,089$ | $-2,236$ | $-17.1 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 48,284 | 52,332 | 41,797 | 38,372 | $-20.5 \%$ |

# Table 5 \% Average Attendance 2003-2005 

|  | Males | Females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003 | 78.7 | 82.1 |
| 2004 | 78.5 | 81.7 |
| 2005 | 79.1 | 82.6 |

## Table 6 <br> \% Difference in Attendance Mon-Fri

| Parish | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Kingston | 16 | 14 |
| St Andrew | 11 | 7 |
| St Thomas | 19 | 16 |
| Portland | 20 | 18 |
| St Mary | 15 | 10 |
| St Ann | 17 | 15 |
| Trelawny | 18 | 18 |
| St James | 16 | 13 |
| Hanover | 22 | 19 |
| Westmoreland | 25 | 25 |
| St Elizabeth | 23 | 20 |
| Manchester | 15 | 11 |
| Clarendon | 19 | 17 |
| Ct Cathorino | 12 | 11 |

## Conclusion:

## -LACK OF PARTICIPATION IS NOT THE EXPLANATION

## , Theory Number 2

## -Girls are Brighter

Table 7
TOP CSEC PERFORMERS, 2001-2004 and 2006

- MALES 4
- FEMALES 1


## Table 8 <br> Top Performers in 7 subjects, 2001-2004 and 2006

|  | Males | Females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | 3 | 4 |
| 2002 | 4 | 3 |
| 2003 | 5 | 2 |
| 2004 | 4 | 3 |
| 2006 | 2 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 18 | 17 |

## -Conclusion

## - Girls are not brighter than boys

## Theory Number 3

## Pedagogy

- Hyacinth Evans:
- Boys perform well when the teaching methods arouse their interests

Critique: There's a point here.

Mark Figueroa:

- Male Privilege in early socialisation turns into male disadvantage in school
-But, why now?


## Conclusion

- Pedagogical issues are clearly significant
- Socialisation issues are also significant


## Theory Number 4

## A CHANGE IN SOCIALISATION

## , Proposition 1

## - The two most powerful AGENTS of Socialisation:

- The Family
- Parents' CONTROL over ego
- Parents' CONTROL over ego's peers
- The School
- Teachers CONTROL over ego
- Teachers CONTROL over ego’s PEERS


## - Proposition 2

Rise in crime is a function of the failure, for many children, especially boys,

1. of the family
<poverty
$\leftarrow$ migration
<breakdown of affective life

- 2. the School
- $\leftarrow$ savaging of the Teaching profession
- 2.1 Era of Mass Education:
- Rate of more schools exceeding rate of trained teachers
- Rise in pupil-teacher ratios
- Shift system
- 2.2 Global shocks
$>$ Lower pay and standard of living
$>$ Exodus (particularly male teachers)
$>$ Hustling on the side
$>$ Homework corrected at school
> Less time for extra-curricular activities
- Results:


## - THIS-

| - 1970 | 8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| - 1995 | 54 |
| - 2005 | $65:$ |

AND THIS....

# Table 9 <br> Major Crimes Committed by Males 16-30 years old in 2005 

Murder
Shooting
Robbery
Rape

70\%
78\%
74\%
68\%
. And THIS

## Table 9

Male Arrests for Murder and Shooting, Age 13-20, 1996-2006

|  | Murder | \% of all <br> murders | Shooting | $\%$ of all <br> shootings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1996 | 85 | 22 | 249 | 28 |
| 1997 | 119 | 24 | 201 | 28 |
| 1998 | 98 | 20 | 225 | 29 |
| 1999 | 102 | 19 | 140 | 24 |
| 2000 | 87 | 16 | 150 | 25 |
| 2001 | 123 | 23 | 147 | 23 |
| 2002 | 139 | 25 | 119 | 19 |
| 2003 | 119 | 18 | 152 | 24 |
| 2004 | 135 | 19 | 134 | 20 |
| 2005 | 96 | 13 | 143 | 19 |
| 2006 | 142 | 20 | 162 | 23 |

