



GRACE, KENNEDY FOUNDATION
LECTURE SERIES 1999



WHAT WE SOW AND WHAT WE REAP

**Barry
Chevannes**

**Problems
in the
cultivation
of Male
Identity in
Jamaica**

Preface

This series of annual lectures presented by the Grace, Kennedy Foundation has ranged across a variety of topics within the social-cultural, economic and political milieu of Jamaica. It is fitting that today's, the eleventh, which focuses on the 'the cultivation of male identity' and on male behaviour in Jamaica, should follow as our next subject after Volunteerism, so eloquently delivered by Dr. Don Robotham.

It should be noted too, that not so long ago, we were treated to presentations from Professor Elsa Leo-Rhynie and Dr. Lucien Jones on *The Jamaican Family* and *The Jamaican Society: Options for Renewal*, respectively.

Today, a distinguished anthropologist, like his immediate predecessor, Dr. Robotham, Dr. Chevannes begins by reiterating a question which is frequently asked: 'What is wrong with our males?' as an expression of concern by an increasing number of people about the behaviour of Jamaican males.

He refers to Professor Errol Miller's study and book, *The Marginalization of the Black Jamaican Male* with its focus on their fallout from the education system. Moreover, there are those who contend that the advances achieved by women in higher education and the professions, in addition to other manifestations to the deterioration in male behaviour, reflect the personal and moral strengths of women in contrast to weaknesses of Jamaican men.

However, Dr. Chevannes is unwilling to accept the 'conventional wisdom'. Drawing on his own research on socialization, he examines three principal areas, which he considers are significant in relation to male performance. These are sexual behaviour, education and crime.

His conclusions based on and illustrated by a wealth of data certainly do not validate the gender bias, which tends to be universally accepted. Moreover, he concludes that to a great extent, the behaviour exhibited by Jamaican males, especially in poor city areas, is the fruit germinating from seed sown by prominent institutions and the more advantaged members of society.

Dr. Chevannes concludes by proposing some innovative initiatives for aborting or, at least, arresting the problems.

Professor the Hon. Gladstone E. Mills, O.J., C.D.
Chairman
Grace, Kennedy Foundation

About the Lecturer



DR. ALSTON BARRINGTON CHEVANNES

The Grace, Kennedy Foundation continues to draw quite heavily on the resources of the University of the West Indies for the lecturers to treat its selected subjects for the now well -established annual Grace, Kennedy Lecture. The lecture was established in 1989 and of the eleven presentations that we have had (including this one) six have been delivered by personnel from the UWI.

Since the ultimate aims of the Grace, Kennedy Lecture are practical, this must moderate somewhat the perception that the UWI is an 'Ivory Tower'. The fact that we return so frequently to

that place for talent shows that we are well satisfied with the service we have received so far.

We are pleased to welcome and present as our 1999 Grace, Kennedy lecturer Dr. Alston Barrington Chevannes, graduate in Philosophy and Classics from Boston College, USA, M.Sc. in Sociology from the UWI and Ph.D. (Anthropology) from Columbia University.

Dr. Chevannes, who was born in Kingston, is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Sociology and Social Work at the UWI and Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences.

In a long and distinguished career as an educator, Dr. Chevannes has taught, at high school level, at St. Mary's College and Campion College and, at university level, at City University of New York and Columbia University as well as at the UWI.

As an international research consultant, Dr. Chevannes has answered demands throughout the West Indies, in Europe and in Africa.

Here in Jamaica, Dr. Chevannes has directed his skill and attention to areas of sociology and anthropological interest leading, hopefully, to a better understanding of issues regarding family and sexual relationships: the abuse of drugs and health: ethnological issues; indigenous religious manifestations such as Revivalism and Rastafarianism sociopolitical movements and Garveyism. Dr. Chevannes has also produced reports on family issues in various territories, which are of invaluable use in Jamaica, Antigua, St Kitts and Nevis, and Barbados. Of special interest are his studies on the work of Development Agencies in Jamaica. He has been a speaker and lecturer in demand in the Caribbean, North America and Europe.

Among many innovative initiatives, Dr. Chevannes is the founder of *Fathers Incorporated*. He is a Christian activist and a musician of some note, being a member of the Liturgical Commission of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Kingston and the composer of widely used religious and folk songs.

Naturally, having pursued a wide range of academic, cultural and practical activities, this distinguished Jamaican has received many awards, local and international. This invitation from the Grace, Kennedy Foundation to present their Lecture in 1999 is further recognition of the great value our country possesses in Barrington Chevannes. Those who can most testify to the treasure that he is are the three ladies in his life - his wife and two daughters.

Introduction

WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR MALES? This is a question on the lips of an increasing number of Jamaicans. The sight of idle males, young and strong, on the street corner, the daily news of the brutal, senseless murders they commit, their virtual dereliction of higher education, their cruelty to women, their display of a value system alien to the one most of us know—all these and many more examples of behaviours that most of us fail to understand prompt the question. In this lecture, as the title suggests, I will argue that it is we ourselves who ask the question who have contributed to whatever it is our males have become or are becoming.

One attempt to provide an answer in the field of education was Errol Miller's *Marginalization of the Black Jamaican Male* (1986). Using carefully researched statistics, Miller traced the feminization of the teaching profession in Jamaica, arguing that it was a deliberate policy on the part of the colonial administration and the white elite to clip the wings of black men and prevent them from soaring into the realms of power where they could pose a challenge to white rule. The teaching profession was one of the most available avenues for upward mobility and leadership, which, in the decades following the end of slavery inevitably translated into *political* representation. By thus feminizing the profession, the white elite created a buffer between itself and the sources of a possible legitimate black challenge to its rule. Miller (1991) later expanded the argument into a general thesis, which he substantiated with data from the United States and the Soviet Union.

In more recent work (Miller 1996), he has set about refining his explanation with his very imaginative theory of place. One's 'place' in society is determined by attributes such as race, class, gender, age, and lineage, which he calls 'operational absolutes'. Through these 'operational absolutes', those who now hold the central places

of power in the post-colonial Caribbean states distribute the rest of the population in a queue from centre to margin, moving groups up and down the queue as a way of holding on to their power. Thus it is that women, a marginalized group, have been moved up the queue, both as a general concession to the demands of marginal groups as well as to serve as junior partners in the consolidation of the power of the elite. If Miller's original argument angered many feminists, his more recent formulation will do nothing to assuage their feeling that the argument attempts to devalue the efforts of women themselves, making the advancement of women a gratuity from men. Instead, the more extreme among them would argue, gender shifts in educational achievements coupled with other developments in male behaviour, exemplify the *personal* and moral strength of women, in contrast to the *personal* and moral weakness of men.

The charge of moral weakness is not a new one. Although we are still uneasy about references to slavery, it might help us to recall that under that institution, there were two moral failings that were attributed to black men. One was the problem of laziness-work-dodging turpitude and unreliability. It gave rise to what was considered a personality type: Kwashi. Thus was the day-name for a Sunday-born male turned into the description of a person who violated the expectations of reliability and hard work. The second failing was sexual promiscuity. As in the United States, so here also, the black males were thought of as over-sexed creatures who sought to fulfil their sexual desires whenever, wherever and with whomever, without regard to any sense of moral responsibility to spouse or children. The double irony of course was the well-documented sexual promiscuity of the planters themselves (Hall 1989) and the expectation that under chattel slavery the chattels would be industrious and anything but devious.

In recalling the period of slavery, we also remind ourselves that the concerns are not directed at all men. Then, they were the

pronouncements of frustrated and fearful masters aimed at slaves, of whites aimed at blacks. Today they are (though not entirely) the concerns of the middle and upper classes about maladies that are largely manifested among the males of the lower social classes, or males originating from those echelons.

In addressing these concerns, I begin first by examining the three main areas where the problem is believed to most manifest sexual behaviour, education, and crime. My objective is to try to separate fact from fiction, where male performance is concerned. In the second section I offer a perspective from which to understand the concerns, drawing upon recent research on socialization (Brown and Chevannes 1998; Chevannes [in press]), and in the third section I go on to suggest what can be done to ease if not arrest the problem.

The Reaping

SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR

One of the charges leveled against Jamaican men is their sexual irresponsibility. Not only do they not stick to one partner, but they also run from commitment and from paternity. The number of single mothers is proof enough: the fathers have abandoned their responsibility. That is why, in this country, it is the women who father their children. The men who stick to one partner, who acknowledge paternity and live up to their responsibility as fathers are the few exceptions. In short, so goes the claim, the majority of Jamaican men are irresponsible.

Dismissing this charge as a stereotype hardly helps to lessen its sting. Nearly everyone is able to tell of some man who fits one or all of the above characteristics. But a stereotype is still a stereotype. Much as it runs against the current of popular opinion to expose it as such, we have to do so. In what follows, I concur that in Jamaica multiple partnerships are a feature of male sexual behaviour, but I reject the notion that it is a characteristic of our men to run from commitment of any sort, in particular, paternity.

In a national stratified random sample survey carried out in 1985 for the National Family Planning Board, I found that only fifty per cent of the males interviewed acknowledged that they had more than one partner. However, many more indicated that they would have liked to have had more, implying that lack of finance was the limiting factor. The findings were greeted with skepticism, it being the view that all Jamaican men had multiple partners. Some, males as well as females, even tried to explain it by the myth of a male shortage. But, for all or most men to have more than one female partner, it would also require all or most women to have more than one male partner-unless it is the case that a small percentage of women are servicing all or most men, which is not likely.

Less than a decade later, yet another national stratified random sample survey was undertaken, much larger and more detailed. In preparation for it, Chambers and Chevannes (1991) conducted six focus group discussions, in which males and females met in separate groups. The males made a clear distinction between *love*, which implied both sex and commitment, and sex, which implied sex but no commitment, and they confirmed that men were not averse to having sex even with women they did not respect. This was truer for adolescent and young adult males than for older middle-class men in their thirties and forties, among whom an outside sexual relationship tended to involve some commitment as well. The women, for their part, also acknowledged that they engaged in multiple relationships. Money played a big role in their motivation, as also feelings of sexual independence. This was the first time, to my knowledge, that a study of any sort had unearthed evidence that females also practiced extra-union relationships. Yet their existence should not have been surprising. How else are *jackets* made?

In conclusion, the charge that men do not stick to one sexual partner can be substantiated for a large proportion, perhaps as high as one-half. The discovery that many women also do not stick to one sexual partner does not negate the effect that men's multiple partnerships have. The differences here between the genders seem to be the higher frequency on the part of the males, the public reputation outside partnerships bring men, the greater secrecy and discretion on the part of the females, and the fact that female multiple partnership does not carry the threat of outside children. But both types of outside sexual relationships are possible because the sanctions against them are weak.

Turning to the issue of fatherhood, the path-breaking study by Brown, Anderson and Chevannes (1991), based on over seven hundred interviews in four rural and urban communities, pointed to

the meaning and importance of fatherhood to men. The men interviewed described fatherhood in terms relative to the construction of their identity. Without children they would feel like "birds without wings", or like "trees without leaves". Children gave them a sense of being grown-up and responsible. The men reported spending considerably more time with their children than popular opinion would have suggested. Although the authors did not attempt to confirm this and other findings by a parallel sample of spouses, a review of the anthropological literature on the family in Jamaica and other parts of the anglophone Caribbean substantiated the finding that fatherhood was a culturally constructed role, which men regarded with pride. The two elements of that construct were to *provide* and to *discipline*.

More recently, in 1996, I under-took an evaluation of the Women's Centre of Jamaica. This involved administering questionnaires to a randomly selected sample of two hundred and thirty-two of its clients over the five years between September 1989 and August 1994, a matching control sample of one hundred and forty-five non-clients, fifty-five baby-fathers of clients, and thirty-six baby-fathers of the controls. The similarities between the clients and the controls were great. Both sets of girls were in stable relationships with their baby-fathers before they became pregnant (84% of the clients and 88% of the controls considered themselves girlfriends), and both underwent great psychological trauma as a result of the pregnancy. It is important to understand that pregnancy in a teenage schoolgirl is received by the family with shame. The girl is subjected to great humiliation, in many cases being thrown out of the house and having to seek refuge with a relative. In some in-depth interviews in the Women's Centre study the girls reported contemplating or attempting suicide. This period of great psychological stress and withdrawal of affection by the family is the time when the support of their baby-fathers is most critical. We surveyed all three hundred and seventy-seven baby-mothers for the level of support rendered by their baby-fathers. The results are

presented in Table 1. Over three-quarters of the girls reported receiving moral support from their partners during the pregnancy, and nearly nine out of every ten of them reported receiving material support.

We asked the girls: How often did he see you during the pregnancy? In order to test what they meant when they said their baby-father stood by them. Table 2 gives the answer. Sixty-seven per cent of the clients and seventy-four per cent of the controls reported that the baby-father either lived with them, visited daily or visited several times per week.

Although the aggregates of those who visited once a week or less were small, it is still useful to see the reasons the girls gave. These are set out in Table 3. Twenty-three per cent of both clients and control said the baby-father lived in a different area, implying that geography made it difficult for him to visit, or that he was a stranger. Twelve per cent of the clients and eleven per cent of the controls cited family pressure from one or both sides, while an equal number cited lack of interest by the baby-father. Another twelve per cent of clients and six per cent of the controls said they told the baby-father not to visit them, for reasons we were unable to ask, while roughly eleven per cent of either group reported problems in the relationship. It is worth noting that only twelve per cent of the clients and thirteen per cent of the controls said that the baby-father doubted or denied his paternity.

Given this high level of support during the pregnancy, we were at first quite surprised to find that the current relations had deteriorated. In Table 4 we observed that the girlfriend-boyfriend relationship had plummeted among clients of the Centre to 22%, from 84%, and among controls 31%, from 88%. On reflection, however, it has been long established by Caribbean anthropologists and demographers that the pattern of conjugal bonding among African-Caribbean peoples shows a very high incidence of the

extremely fragile and unstable kind of relationship we call *visiting* at the start of the mating cycle, and a progressive development through the life-cycle towards greater stability. We should not have been surprised. That under one-third of the clients and over one-quarter of the controls remained social friends with their baby-fathers indicates a greater sense of realism. After all, pregnancy transforms a girl into a woman, maturation unmatched by anything similar in a young man. Nonetheless, if we were to add to the boyfriends, fiancés and spouses, the many who remained social friends, we have more than sixty per cent of the girls and young men on quite good terms. We asked the girls, finally, about their current levels of baby-father support and heard that among both clients and controls child support was of the order of seventy per cent. Thirty-four per cent of the clients and over forty per cent of the controls reported personal support from the baby-father.

The available data, then, does not substantiate the charge that Jamaican men are by nature sexually irresponsible, a charge with a hidden subtext, which reads: Jamaican women are by nature sexually responsible. Neither does the data substantiate the charge that Jamaican men run from paternal obligations. Yet the number of women who have to take their baby-fathers to the family court, or waylay them outside the factory gate on payday, or the number of baby-fathers who, once they reach the United States, 'forget' their responsibility to provide, lend credence to the charge. These cannot be explained away, and no one should attempt to do so. However, my point is that, so far, no study has uncovered data to substantiate the charge that the behaviour of such men is the norm.

EDUCATION

In the field of education, the general perception is that females are outperforming males. Females are more conscientious in their school attendance, graduate with higher marks and are preparing themselves better for life by going on to the institutions of higher

learning. There they win proportionately more honours and graduate in larger numbers than the males. But is this a true picture of what is happening?

On the understanding that if females are out-performing males in the education system it does not matter which year one examines for proof, I have chosen the 1996-97 academic year, the most recent for which CXC data is available. Treating those who sat those examinations as the cohort, which began its school career in 1986-87 and advanced grade by grade, year after year, I tracked their enrolment figures through to 1996-97 (Table 5). My assumption was that enrolment figures might be a useful indicator of exposure to learning.

The most striking feature of Table 5 is the consistently higher annual attrition rate of males. The first column lists the enrolment figure, the second the number of repeaters. By subtracting the repeaters from those enrolled, we get the actual enrolment of new pupils, and this is presented in the third column. To arrive at the attrition rate for a grade, I calculated the net loss over the previous year (fourth column) and present this in the fifth column as a percentage. The only year in which the boys showed a net gain over the previous year was 1987-88, when they moved from Grade 1 to Grade 2. By contrast, the girls showed net gains in Grades 2 and 3 and 7. There was only one exceptional year, Grade 4 in 1989-90, when the cohort lost more girls than boys, 1,378 girls, but only 659 boys. The general trend, however, is for fewer girls to drop out and to show a lower rate. Males entered Grade I with a numerical advantage of nearly two thousand, but left Grade 11 over two thousand fewer. By Grade 5 there were already more girls in school.

This pattern of attrition is not unique to that cohort. The cohort who began five years earlier, in 1981-82, ended Grade 10 with 17,116 boys compared to 18,996 girls (Table 6). The data for the

cohort which began five years later, in 1991 (Table 7), shows the same trend. Table 8 provides a summary of the rates of attrition between Grade 1 and Grade 6 for the ten cohorts from 1981-82 to 1990-91. The magnitude varies between a low of 15.8%, for the cohort beginning in 1988-89, and a high of 19.6% 1982-83 cohort. No matter which age cohort is examined, the trend is the same: a higher rate of male attrition in enrolment throughout the primary and secondary school years.

To return to the 1986-87 cohort. At the end of the 1994-95 school year, it lost somewhat under 7,000 males and some 5,500 females (Table 5). A large proportion of these was students from the All-Age Schools whose formal school career came to an end in Grade 9. The rate of loss among the males was 30 per cent, among the females 23 per cent. Students in the All-Age schools are allowed to sit one of two examinations in Grade Nine, which could qualify them to enter Grade 10. These are the Grade Nine Achievement Test for entry into Secondary High Schools, and the Junior High School Certificate Examinations for entry into Secondary and Comprehensive High Schools. Those who fail cannot enter Grade 10 in a secondary school and so have come to the end of their education within the school system. Here, for the first time, is a suggestion that the male performance has not been on par with that of their female counterparts.

One reason for the poorer performance of the boys undoubtedly lies in their uniformly lower rate of school attendance. Table 9 tracks the rate of attendance of our cohort through their Primary and All-Age School years. The picture is clear, but not encouraging. Rural schools show a lower rate of attendance than urban schools, All-Age schools a lower rate than Primary schools, and boys a uniformly lower rate than girls. These rates apply from Grade I through to Grade 9. Thus, a boy attending a rural All-Age school is at the greatest possible disadvantage. A girl attending a rural All-Age school also has a significantly lower attendance rate

than her urban counterpart, but also a significantly higher rate than her male rural All-Age counterpart. Neither All-Age boys nor All-Age girls could, with their level of attendance, expect to perform as well as the All-Age boys and girls in the city, all things being equal, but the average All-Age boy, with a lower level of attendance, is bound to perform worse than the All-Age girl.

Differential rates of attendance between the genders are best explained within the context of the socialization process, which I shall address in Section 11. For now, I wish to call attention to the veritable army of fourteen and fifteen-year-olds who are, as it were, demobilized every year, but who, unlike Caesar's army, are without land or pay, and must fend for themselves. Since they are some two or three years too young to enter the vocational academics run by the HEART/NTA system, or the National Youth Service, thousands of young people, not yet socially mature, with, at most, only the hint of a skill, are disgorged into a society not yet ready for them, unsympathetic and unwelcoming.

It takes little imagination to consider the social problem posed by the year after year accumulation of six or seven thousand male fifteen-year-olds, the majority of whom are unemployed or idle. We lack sociological data on this important sector of the youth population, the no-longer-in-school young people between fifteen and nineteen years old, and especially the males. Many of the females in this group may be found at the maternity clinics where they attend in preparation for childbearing. Their baby-fathers, however, come from the next older age-cohort, on average six or seven years removed. But on their male age-mates we have very little information.

Meanwhile, as their former colleagues continued through to Grade 11, the 1986-87 male cohort lost another 19 per cent. The females lost a comparable proportion as well, over 16 per cent, but still ended up over two thousand stronger. Thus it came about that they

sat the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) papers in larger numbers than the males. It is well worth the while to examine the results, which I reproduce from the Ministry of Education's Education Statistics 1996-97 as Table 10. They reveal that in the Grades 1 and 2 passes at the end of 1996-97 the males performed slightly or clearly better than the females in nineteen of the thirty-five subjects sat. The nineteen subjects were: Agricultural Science (double award), Agricultural Science (single award), Agricultural Science (crops and soils), Art and Craft, Building Technology, Chemistry, Clothing and Textiles, Electrical /Technology, Electricity/ Electronics, French, Home Management, Information Technology, Integrated Science, Mathematics, Metals, Principles of Accounts, Principles of Business, Technical Drawing, and Woods. In four of these, however, Biology, Home Management, Principles of Accounts and Principles of Business, the margins were too slight to be meaningful.

The females, for their part, performed marginally or clearly better than the males in sixteen subjects. These were: Art, Biology, Caribbean History, Craft, English Language, English Literature, Food and Nutrition, Geography, Mechanical Engineering Technology, Office Procedures, Physics, Religious Education, Shorthand, Social Studies, Spanish, and Typewriting. In two of these, Biology and Home Management, the margins were insignificant.

When Grade 3 passes were included, overall gender performance underwent some shifts. Males performed better in fifteen subjects: Agricultural Science [single award], Agricultural Science [crops and soils], Art and Craft, Chemistry, Clothing and Textiles, Electricity/ Electronics, French, Information Technology, Integrated Science, Mathematics, Principles of Accounts, Principles of Business, and Woods. Discounting the margins in Clothing and Textiles, Information Technology, Principles of Accounts and Woods, this reduces the fifteen subjects to eleven.

Females, on the other hand, were better in twenty subjects. These were: Agricultural Science (double award), Art, Building Technology, Caribbean History, Craft, Electrical /Technology, English Language, English Literature, Food and Nutrition, Geography, Home Management, Mechanical Engineering Technology, Metals, Office Procedures, Physics, Religious Education, Shorthand, Social Studies, Spanish, and Typewriting. Four of these could be discounted as not meaningful: Building Technology, Geography, Office Procedures, and Woods thus reducing the number of subjects in which females performed better to sixteen.

In interpreting the data presented in Table 10, we should be cautious against placing undue weight on levels of performance in subjects in which the aggregates are mismatched. When, for example, 27 males sat Clothing and Textiles, and outperformed the 686 females, we can assume a different result had the aggregates been closer to par. Similarly, a different result in gender performance might have been likely had the number of girls who sat Mechanical Engineering Technology been closer to the number of males.

In summary, when only Grades 1 and 2 are calculated, the gender performances were more or less on par, with the males outperforming the females in fifteen of the thirty-five subjects, and the females out-performing the males in fourteen. When Grade 3 was included, the females were shown to have clearly done better in five more subjects. The argument that females are out-performing males was not substantiated in the outcome of the 1996-97 CXC examinations, at least where passes at Grades 1 and 2 were concerned. Up to 1996-97, Grade 3 was still not accepted as a pass; what mattered was the pass at Grade 1 or Grade 2. In any case, if girls were in fact better achievers than boys were, this should have shown itself at the higher levels as well.

A second noteworthy point in Table 10 is the obvious gender bias that prevailed in eighteen of the thirty subjects, seven for males, and eleven for females. I regard a gender bias to be prevailing in a given subject if the ratio of those who sat was three or more times in favour of one gender than the other. Based on this definition, Building Technology, Electronic Technology, Electricity/Electronics, Mechanical Engineering Technology, Metals, Technical Drawing, and Woods were the 'male' subjects. The 'female' subjects were Clothing and Textiles, Craft, Food and Nutrition, French, Home Management, Office Procedure, Religious Education, Shorthand, Social Studies, Spanish, and Typewriting. These biases are not surprising. They follow the pattern of socialization, whereby females are prepared for skills focused on the home, or on traditional occupations at the workplace, while boys are prepared for what are perceived as money-making, technological skills. However, male aggregates in the 'male' subjects were not as great as female aggregates in the 'female' subjects. Technical Drawing was the only subject in which male candidates numbered over a thousand. By contrast there were five 'female' subjects in which the candidates were numbered in the thousands.

Just to ensure that the males in our cohort were not exceptional, I compared these results with those for the previous three years. This data is shown in Table 11 and it confirms the gender bias. By my definition, there were four 'female' subjects over the last two years where the ratios were less than 3: 1. These were Craft, Religious Education, Social Studies and Spanish. Obviously, one cannot declare a shift toward gender equity in these subjects on the basis of the results for one or two years.

To summarize thus far, an examination of education statistics indicates the following:

- a. as children progress through the education system, the males exhibit a higher rate of attrition, leading to a reversal of their numerical superiority the further along they go; consequently, there is marked under-participation by males in primary and secondary education:
- b. there is a gender bias operating in the selection of certain subjects as against others;
- c. No evidence was found to substantiate the belief that girls routinely outperform boys, but ample evidence of gender performance both ways in a number of subject areas.

These conclusions are based on data up to the secondary level. The analysis would be incomplete if we did not also examine what has been happening at the tertiary level. But before proceeding, I would like to propose that under-performance of the males in English Language has far more important consequences for them than under-performance in Mathematics has for the females. Lack of command of English, the language of instruction, must also translate into a less than adequate grasp of those subject areas that require much reading in English. Such subjects are English Literature, Social Studies and Caribbean History, three subjects in which male performance is consistently weaker. The English results are routinely weak among girls as well, and until it is properly taught as the second language it is, there will not, in my opinion, be any improvement in overall passes. But the increasing acceptance of our nation language as an art form in both music and poetry, coupled with the male dominance in these two spheres, provides less incentive for males to master English.

To carry the analysis further, I will briefly examine male enrolment and performance at the tertiary level. Since no data was readily available for enrolment by gender in tertiary institutions except for the University of Technology (UTECH) and the Mona campus of the University of the West Indies (UWI), I have, therefore, concentrated on these two institutions.

The first point I would like to draw attention to is that the deep-rooted gender -orientations we noted at the secondary school level, where males pursue the more technologically and vocationally based subjects while the females pursue the ones based more on the liberal arts, continue into university. The enrolment pattern at the University of Technology from 1990-91 to 1996-7 (Table 12) clearly shows male dominance in Building, Architecture and Engineering. The areas dominated by women are Commerce, Hospitality and Food Science, Science and Health Science, and Technical Education. The latter is a discipline for those who intend to go into teaching, and that may explain the dominance of females there. Note that the proportion of males at the UTECH fluctuates between 45 per cent and 48 per cent. At the UWI, up to the mid-1990s, the Faculty of Pure and Applied Sciences was the faculty of choice for men, followed by the Faculty of the Social Sciences. Since 1995, both faculties have been attracting an equal number of men and women. Among the women, the trend was towards the Faculty of Arts and Education followed by the Faculty of the Social Sciences. Now, however, this trend has been reversed, with the largest number of women choosing the Faculty of the Social Sciences followed by the Faculty of Arts and Education.

Thus, at both Universities, the gender-biases dictate where the largest numbers of men and women are to be found. One conclusion that would follow from this is that, at the present time, the only way the Mona campus of the UWI will achieve gender parity or near-parity in its numbers is to offer more of the kind of subjects found at the UTECH or at polytechnics.

The second point is that, at the UWI for the period of the 1990s, men have been graduating with consistently higher rates of first-class honours but consistently lower rates of upper and lower second-class honours (Table 11). As a result, they graduate with a higher rate of mere passes. Therefore, only in this sense can it truly

be said that women are out-performing men at the UWI; out-performing them, that is, in second-class honours.

So how, then, can we say from this analysis of education data that males have been or are being marginalized? Two problems are clearly evident. The first is the lower rates of participation in school, both in terms of enrolment and in terms of attendance. One result of this is the larger numbers of boys who do not make it into secondary school, but for whom no provision has been made to absorb them into society. I reckon that for every cohort of male students turned loose into their communities with only a Grade 9 level education, a direct link is invited to crime and other forms of anti-social behaviour. Furthermore, by the time they have been accepted into HEART/NTA programmes many of them will have regressed in terms of literacy.

The second problem is derived from the gender-bias that begins to be manifest at the secondary level and continues into the tertiary level. One way to put it is to say that, by narrowing their interest in pursuing tertiary education to the technical and applied subjects, men, in far greater proportion than women, are depriving themselves of the overall benefits of higher education. Put another way, tertiary education in Jamaica is not sufficiently attractive to them.

But if capable young Jamaican men do not go on to earn degrees, where do they go? Given their orientation, I would expect that they would enter into the formal and informal sectors of the economy in larger numbers than women would. And by 'informal sector' I do not mean higglering. The term, as first used by Keith Hart (1982), referred to all the myriad legal and illegal ways of making a living, but which lie outside the formally structured economy. However, since we lack gender-specific data on this sector, this opinion is speculative.

CRIME

Up to that sad year of 1980 when male youths of the city of Kingston were among those who, blinded by political partisanship, were responsible for the deaths of most of the nine hundred people who were murdered in that year, Kingston was a pretty safe city. People had begun to grille their homes, mainly to prevent break-ins rather than to protect life. The nights had not yet come when, with robbery as his motive, a young man breaks into a home and having taken his loot murders his victims on leaving. At the time of the Orange Street fire in 1980 when one of the arsonists reportedly snatched a baby from the arms of its fleeing mother and hurled the child into the engulfing flames a rumour circulated that he and the other villains had drugged themselves on cocaine, at that time still a strange drug, in order to carry out the crime. And when this was followed by the burning of the Eventide Home at the top of Slipe Pen Road, in which 153 elderly poor perished, the rumour grew. It was inconceivable to many of us that politics could so possess human beings as to make them perform such cold and heartless acts towards other human beings, not to mention the most helpless of all, the children and the twice-children, unless they were also somehow possessed, and therefore not responsible. The political struggles of 1980 having been resolved and relative peace having returned to the city, most of us were willing to put 1980 behind us as an unusual but explainable nightmarish past, uncharacteristic of Jamaica and Jamaicans.

Alas, today the atrocities are all too frequent, so much a part of current experience that it becomes meaningless to attribute them to possession by cocaine. The worry is that a new and different kind of human being has been bred and let loose upon the society, whom we do not know, whose actions are conscious and consciously different. Almost as worrying as the atrocities themselves are the fact that increasingly they no longer chill.

People have grown numb, the once-too-often victims of shock. There are no more tears.

The statistics tell a revealing story. The figures from the Economic Social Survey of Jamaica, 1996, show that, apart from the extraordinary year of 1980, there was a steady rise in the number of murders committed every year for the twenty years between 1976 and 1996. There were two plateaus: one in the 1970s, when the annual number of people murdered was between three hundred and four hundred; the other in the 1980s, when the annual figure fluctuated between four hundred and five hundred. Between these plateaus, the figure for the election year of 1980 rose extremely sharply to just under nine hundred murders. Then, for the 1990s there was a very steep increase in the number of murders which, by 1996, had already passed the total for 1980.

If politics was, as believed, at the root of the murders of the 1970s and 1980s, the explanations for the murderous 1990s, according to official data, vary between domestic disputes and gang feuding over drugs. In the early 1990s, domestic or inter-personal disputes accounted for as many as four out of every ten murders. By 1996 and 1997, this number was down to two out of every ten. By contrast, it appears, drug and gang feuds have grown, accounting for 34% of the murders in 1995, 42% in 1996 and 36% in 1997.

The victims are, as we know, overwhelmingly male, between 88.5% in 1992 and 90.5% in 1996. The annual Economic and Social Survey of Jamaica (ESSJ) year after year describes them as "labourers and unemployed", or "unskilled labourers and unemployed", and only once, in 1996, as "labourers, higglers, farmers and taxi drivers". They fall mainly in the age groups 16 to 30 years.

As far as the murderers and accused are concerned, only in the last two years do we begin to get official confirmation of what most of

us know as street knowledge, namely how young the gunmen and shata (shotters) are. This is presented in Table 12, which also includes data on shootings, rape and robbery. Rape and robbery are usually pursued with the aid of a gun.

Of the over three hundred and eighty murders in 1996 and the nearly five hundred in 1997, for which arrests were made, nearly eight out of every ten the police believed were committed by persons-males we assume-thirty years old and younger. Some of them were as young as a thirteen-year-old Grade 8 or Grade 9 student. We may assume also that the unsolved murders were committed by the same age group.

Along with the murders we should also consider shooting, a crime which involves personal injury. Eighty per cent of shootings in 1996 and eighty per cent of shootings in 1997, for which arrests were made, were committed by the same group. The comparable figures for robbery are 88% in 1996 and 78% in 1997. The group also accounted for 70% of rape and carnal abuse in 1996 and 61% in 1997.

In other words, our murderers and major criminals are mainly youths. That is to say, they come from that section of the population which most indulges in football, including six-a-side, which comprises the most avid players and fans of the game, whose favourite music is dance-hall, whose idols are the most popular DJ artistes, and who wear or aspire to the latest in designer clothes and footwear. At age thirty, the oldest would have been born in the late 1960s and grew up knowing the political violence of the 1970s, but would have been too young to participate in it. The younger ones would have only heard tell of it and would, therefore, not have known or been a part of the youth-led community-based volunteerism that also came with the 70s. We are led to believe from the reports which describe them as 'unskilled labourers and unemployed' that most would have come

from among the army of males disappearing from the school system at Grades 8, 9 and 10, ill-prepared for the world of work, unemployed. We do have a problem here.

It might be useful at this point to summarize the line of argument in this section.

1. The perception that males are by nature sexually and parentally more irresponsible than females is not substantiated by available research.
2. Analysis of data on primary, secondary and university education shows that males drop out in greater numbers throughout the system, so that the further up they go, the more girls seem to 'out-perform' them by higher levels of participation.
3. The differences between genders at the same level are for the most part insignificant. Where they do exist, however, they are related to performances in different subjects, most of which carry a gender bias, e.g. English is for girls, Mathematics is for boys, and so on.
4. These socialized perceptions about subjects work against male participation within the system.
5. The ranks of the dropouts form the 'abandoned' cohort, without skill or basic education, without opportunities other than the informal and illegal to shape male identity-thus the present cadre of criminals and near-criminals.

The magnitude and overall effect of these perceived and actual behaviours provide the basis for our concern. Before presenting a perspective from which we might be able to understand what is happening to our men, I would like to caution against treating the problems of male sexual, educational and criminal behaviours as separate, requiring separate, and therefore piecemeal, solutions. Instead, as will become more apparent later on, they are all linked

together as vital elements in the social construction of a certain idea of masculine identity.

The Sowing

IN A SITUATION WHERE ONE PERSON out of a population is a deviant, we would focus an explanation of his deviance on the formation of his personality. But in a situation where an entire section of a population is deviant, our focus inevitably must be directed to processes that shape the foundations of behaviour. Apart from our most basic instincts of survival, such as breathing, eating and drinking, human behaviour is the result of learning the meanings, values and intentions of our actions. These meanings, values and intentions are acquired by social intercourse with a collective, a family, a peer group, a community, and a society. Without the collective we would remain animals, of course, but we would never become human. For one thing, we would never be able to speak, and, if we could not speak, we would never be able to think or to communicate effectively or be the object of the communication of others. This process whereby we construct our foundations of behaviour is what we call socialization.

Socialization is, therefore, an interactive process, in which each individual internalizes the meanings, values and behavioural norms of a collective. Within the collective, some people exert greater influence than others in the construction of such meanings, values and norms, in their transmission, as well as in the timing of their transmission do. Thus, for infants and very young children, the older members of the family are more influential. Later on, teachers exert greater influence, sometimes surpassing that of parents and older siblings. This fact is seldom of concern to parents, who see the school as an effective adjunct to the home. However, it is often the case that the peer groups or the wider community or society exerts influences that are not only greater than the influence of parents but which contradict those nurtured within the family. In such cases, the sites where the socialization takes place are both outside the home and outside the control of

parents. Secondly, socialization is an interactive process. If, we are socialized by others, we also socialize others. For the construction of meaning and the determination of values and norms are never fixed and frozen in time or space, but are ever the creation of our interactions. This is true even of children. Children do socialize one another, and socialize others as well, including their own parents. It is therefore misleading to conceive of socialization as a one-way process, from adults to children. Thirdly, for any individual, socialization is an on-going and never-ending process. We never cease being socialized or socializing others. Were this not so, once socialized we could never change our values or our outlook, could never acquire new ways of speaking, or construct new meanings. Finally, socialization does not replace consciousness and freedom. It does not assume conformity. The fact that one learns how to talk does not translate into the compulsion to talk. Thus, part of the process itself is given to determining and communicating the consequences of deviance, the meaning and weight of sanctions. Conformity to the ideals may be the result of fear of the consequences of deviance as it may be the result of affective identification.

In what now follows I present a summary of the main highlights of the socialization process in Jamaica whereby the normative ideals of gender identity and behaviour are constructed and represented. Some of them are common to the Caribbean region, if not universal. The summary is based on recent studies coming out of the University of the West Indies, in particular Bailey et al. (1997), Brown and Chevannes (1998), Chevannes (in press).

GENDER DIVISION

Common to virtually every known society is a division of labour along gender lines. The division takes as its defining axis the family, however constituted, since this is the basic unit of social organization. At its most general, work aimed at creating and

maintaining a nurturing environment for the young and vulnerable members of the species is the responsibility of the female; work aimed at providing support for the unit is the responsibility of the male. In Jamaica and the rest of the Caribbean males and females are socialized to identify domestic work as female, and work outside the domestic sphere, but supportive of it, as male. Thus, cooking, washing, bathing, grooming, dressing and nursing children, tidying up the house, and such the like, are chores seen as the responsibility of the females, while chores relative to the household economy, such as animal husbandry, artisan skills, farming, wage labour, and other outdoor forms of income-earning, are the responsibility of the male. The fact that many boys are required to perform some 'female' tasks, as happens in a family of all or mostly boys, or that many girls are required to undertake 'male' tasks, in a family of all girls, is of little consequence as far as the behavioural norms are concerned. What matters is the gender significance of what is done. Even as they perform such cross-gender tasks, children are made aware of their gender significance, which is usually rationalized, as preparation for an independent and self-reliant life. Boys, as soon as they are able to, will resist performing such simple tasks as washing up dishes and tidying the house. Among those they find most repulsive is any chore, which brings them into contact with female underwear, washed or unwashed. Also high on the list of male taboos is disposal of night soil, in families without water closets.

The gender divisions in the household are often contrasted as light work or work requiring little physical exertion as against heavy work demanding great physical strength. Hence the ideas that tough work is male work and that a boy should be trained to be capable, by endurance, of tough work. The socialization of the boy child is often aimed at making him tough. His punishment is, generally speaking, much more severe than that meted out to the girl child. Believing in corporal punishment as a means of control and a means of "bending the tree while it is young", Jamaicans

further believe that from the time a boy approaches adolescence only a man is strong enough to bend a wayward sapling. Up to that age, corporal punishment is generally exercised by mothers, thereafter by fathers, uncles or older siblings who are able to "drop man lick". To the provider role which a father is expected to perform is added the role of ultimate disciplinarian, the one to whom a mother appeals if the punishment she gives is ineffectual. "Wait till yu faada come home!" often gets quicker results than the cajoling or flogging of a mother. Incidentally, this role of the father is hardly compatible with that of a warm and nurturing parent. The society cannot have it both ways. In those situations where the mother is the sole parent, her punishment of a habitually wayward son can be downright cruel.

A boy is also the first to suffer deprivation where the children are exposed. If resources do not allow for the children to attend school all at the same time, girls are given the advantage over boys. One would have thought that parents who are not able to afford 'lunch money' would make sure that the children attended school where they are able to get food supplied by the School Feeding programme. But, interestingly, the people think otherwise. No lunch money, no school. Lunch money for only one, the girl goes, the boy stays back. Necessity is made into a virtue, as suffering becomes a means of producing a hardened man who knows how to survive.

"School is girl stuff!" This declaration by an eight-year old inner-city boy to my research assistant reveals the association of meaning built up in the minds of many boys. He was actually quite proud of the fact that it was his absence from school that allowed his sister to be present. But training in survival through deprivation and harsh treatment and constructing male identity through provider roles are not the only factors that give girls a school advantage. Parents will push through school any child, girl or boy,

who shows exceptional intellectual endowment, but because of their naturally earlier development, girls tend to be more favoured.

The nurture-provider gender axis forms one of the bases of gender identity among children. Whereas girls are preoccupied with acquiring nurturing skills, boys are learning from quite an early age the need to acquire money. In rural communities, their farming initiatives are encouraged; in urban communities, their initiatives are developed on the streets and in the markets. Many boys cannot guarantee their own attendance at school unless they work. In the scale of priorities, school and education rank lower than making money, although an education is also valued. By the time he was thirteen years old, Bully tells us, he owned six head of cattle in his village in Portland, his twelve-year-old brother had three and his ten-year-old brother two. His father, he said, was proud of them. By contrast, their only sister became the only sibling to sit the Common Entrance Examination, which she passed and went on to Happy Grove High School. Now a forty-five-year-old JAMAL student, he refers to their early morning routine of animal husbandry as "animal school", the real school coming several hours after and three miles away. In an inner-city community where we recently conducted fieldwork, a fourteen-year-old boy who had dropped out of school to become an armed peddler of cocaine was hoping that when he had earned enough to be able to get himself and his mother out of the ghetto and into the United States he would then go back to school. But for now, making money was far more important.

What does a young boy expect to do with money? He learns that this is how he begins to "make life" and earn the respect of his family, his peers and the wider community. Making life is active, not passive. It governs gender relations as well as economic activities. By the time a boy reaches eight or nine years old, he would have already known that in his present relationship with girls and his future relationship with women, the active role is his.

"Is man look human, not human look man!" By contrast, for a woman who assumes the active role in inter-gender relations is considered loose. These ideas are common to females as well and determine their expectations of males. In research carried out by Claudia Chambers and me, women reported that one of their reasons for engaging in multiple partnerships was economic. And in a study for the National Family Planning Board, more men approved of multiple partnerships than actually engaged in them, the difference being that they could not afford the outside relationship. Only in recent years have we observed successful informal commercial importers using their economic power to keep younger men, whom they do not expect to work. But, generally speaking, the construction of male identity has as a principal building block the ideal of control over economic resources. We can therefore imagine the crisis of identity suffered by a man who is failing in the imperative to "make life", but who must relate to women. The turn to illegal activities must be understood in this context. In Herbert Gayle's study of coping strategies in an inner-city community, men are expected to "make life" by fair means, juggling, or by foul means, hustling. Juggle, if you can, but hustle if you must. But you must do something. To do nothing is to be judged and branded "worthless".

As a second line of defense in the struggle to become and remain a man, hustling raises an issue of morality. For many men, meeting the demands of a male identity is a far greater moral imperative than the virtues of honesty and respect for property and even life. We do well to remember that Anansi is male, and in one of the tales about him, he survives at the expense of his wife and children. Survival as a virtue has been a part of the social and cultural life of the African-Jamaicans from the earliest times and remains a fundamental part of the ethos of the people, particularly in these hard times. And although it applies to females also, as when some women enter into relationships with men for economic reasons-no romance without finance-or when domestic helpers

pilfer without remorse from employers they believe to be better off, the main thrust in the socialization for survival is directed towards the male. Apart from their exposure to deprivation, boys learn survival skills through their unsupervised exposure to the world outside the yard, to the street or the road, in effect to the peer group.

A girl's life, for as long as she remains dependent, is surrounded by a protective ring, which starts at home, encompasses the school and ends at home. Her whereabouts are known-home, school or on an errand. Even the time it takes to get home from school is sometimes known and monitored by parents, or must be accounted for. By contrast, as soon as a boy approaches pre-pubescent years and the peer group begins to exercise its magnetic pull, he is allowed to socialize outside the home, that is "out a' street", or "out a' road" - out of the direct control and supervision of parents. Once his chores and errands are done, there is no demand for a boy to remain in the yard. Indeed, too great an attachment to the confines of the yard is regarded as problematic, the symptom of a maladjusted, effeminate male - a maamaman. Left to his own devices, a boy learns from and with his peers the tricks and trade of the street culture, how to navigate the dangers, how to exploit them.

As a socializing site, the street or the road or the Village Square is a male domain, in contrast to the yard, which is a female domain. There, males of all ages have the license to move about and socialize without censure. Running free in this unsupervised setting, boys gather experience in risk-taking. They play their own games of chance, including gambling, model their behaviour after young male adults, hang out on the corner or in the square, fish in the river, swim in the sea, go bird-shooting, hop trucks, test and perfect their bicycle-riding skills, follow a sound system, invent or learn their own speech pattern, learn how to talk to girls, experience the art of heterosexual intercourse and homophobic

discourse, and run boat (organize communal cooking). It is the peer group that will put the final touches, so to speak, to the construction of his male identity-his anti-homosexual heterosexuality, power and control over women through control over financial and other resources, paternity, and the importance of respect.

The peer group virtually replaces mother and father as the controlling agents or, if not entirely a substitute, a countervailing force. An adolescent boy's friends-his "spaar", "staar", "my yout", "posse", "crew"- exact an affinity and a loyalty as sacred as the bond of kinship, as strong as the sentiment of religion. They socialize one another, the older members of the group acting as the transmitters of what passes as knowledge, invent new values and meanings. This is what parents mean when they speak of "bad company". "Bad Company" simply means my son's friends *whom I do not know*, or *whom I do not approve* of. Its bonding power and its potential for deviance scare parents. When "bad company" turns out to be everywhere the same, sharing the same departure from the norms of the yard and acquiring the same symbols and the same meaning, then we have a generation gap. That is all right if the departure is not great. When, however, it results in the kinds of divergences that produce one of the highest murder rates in the world, we have not a generation gap but a generation of strangers, people we ourselves have produced but no longer recognize.

We do not, for example, know how or why it is that the gun has become such a symbol of young male identity at this turn of century, but it has. The proliferation of guns is not simply a function of the drug trade but the ultimate representation of what it means to be a man, the object of the fear and respect of others and the fearless defender of one's own self-respect. Not every youth who owns a gun is a gunman. In inner-city Jamaica and many other parts of the country, the illegal possession of the gun by many male youths functions in exactly the same way as legal

possession does-as the ultimate defense. In an era in which the greatest social sin among young males today is to *dis*, that is to show disrespect, the gun is the ultimate guarantor of respect. That also is why the gun salute has been appropriated from the state. The gun has become a sort of language among the young people. The most common gesture of a young male in an angry exchange is a hand tensed in the shape of a pistol and an arm pivoting in symbolic intent. And who can forget Dionne Hemmings's gesture after capturing the Olympic gold for Jamaica-her right arm and hand extended in symbolic gun salute? The so-called inner-city don is a role model not only because of his ability to command and dispense largesse, but also because he is a living source of power-the power over life and over death, the ultimate *man*. Among the youth, a common name for the penis was rifle, according to the study by Chambers and Chevannes. In inner-city communities, the dream of many a young boy is to be able to own a gun, preferably for himself, but jointly with the crew if necessary.

No one willed or intended all this to be so. No political boss or don would admit that his or her drive for five-year power was intended to produce press *button* (pre-pubescent assassins) and *shata*. No television station or cable company would concede that it has any responsibility for violence and coarse behaviour becoming a way of life, nor would any franchise holder in Kingston. The parents who afford the Nike track shoes but will not afford the school fees, or who abuse teachers for attempting to discipline children, the teachers who neither teach nor mentor, the women who transport the guns, the mothers who shield the community 'protectors', the officers and agents of the law who shoot when 'attacked with a knife'-none see themselves as sharing responsibility for this generation of strangers. The failure of the system of justice to dispense justice with dispatch and equity, even the 'global' twenty-first century, American society in which one can literally walk into a store with dollars and walk out with guns, load them into a barrel

and ship them to Jamaica, all have to be seen as contributing parts of the problem. And therein lies a great difficulty, for where blame is so diffuse; no one can accept responsibility. But in a way we all are responsible. We provide the building blocks, the young people design and construct their own edifice. We are reapers of our own sowing.

Cultivating Higher Yields

ARE MALES BEING MARGINALIZED? Certainly not, if the main factor being considered is power. Despite the increasing percentages of women at the University of the West Indies, it is the men who are elected to the seat of student power. At community level, whether the issue is dons or youth club leaders, there is no marginalization of males. And as far as the churches are concerned, women's over-representation in the membership and ministering groups, but under-representation in the leadership echelons is well-documented (Austin-Broos 1997; Toulis 1996). The marginalization discourse always ignores these facts.

If educational performance is our criterion, the picture still does not allow us to conclude with an unreserved yes. What becomes obvious from examining the data is male *under-participation* or *under-representation* in the key institution designed to prepare the young for life, namely the education system. This, coupled with the high visibility of male youth unemployment, creates a greater impression of marginality. There are proportionately more unemployed young females than unemployed young males, but the impression is one of male and not female marginality. Young unemployed females do not hang out on the street corners and in the village squares, nor do young unemployed males hang around the yard trying to find something to do. The socialization process does not operate that way.

But under-participation in the education system, through lower enrolment and attendance rates, is bound to have consequences for educational performance and, since occupational placement is increasingly being determined by educational competence, bound to result in some social dislocation. And therein lies a great irony. For, as Figueroa (1996) argues, male educational under-performance is a function of the socialization process, which privileges males. Figueroa and Hand (1996) show that the

generally higher rate of investment in the education of girls reaps significantly higher returns double the returns for males up to Grade 11 and greater by a fifth up to Grade 13. As bad as our present problems are, they would be far worse but for the ability of the informal sector to absorb functionally illiterate males, who are somehow able to make and consolidate their transition to manhood, sometimes rising to positions of leadership within their communities. Expansion of the formal sector of the economy at the expense of the informal would therefore make it difficult for males to drop out of or under-participate in school and still get by.

Insofar as our values place a premium on fashioning the male into a tough, invulnerable sort of human being, no change can be expected in parents protecting their girls and exposing their boys. Girls will continue to exhibit higher rates of enrolment and attendance, especially where the family's economic circumstances force parents to be selective in their attention. But even if economic conditions were to enable a family to send all its children to school at the same time, there are two urgent issues, which still need to be addressed. One is the All-Age school leavers who are deprived of further secondary education and who will have no chance for another three or more years to access any kind of formal training.

The second issue concerns what we teach and how. There has to be a conscious effort to make school more attractive to boys. One of the findings to emerge from the study of male socialization was a strong perception among boys and young adult males in an inner-city community in Kingston that success at the CXC examinations brought them no advantage in terms of employment, whereas it did not matter whether the girls succeeded or not. Hence, their conclusion: school is for girls. A recent study, 'Youth Unemployment in Jamaica' by Dr Patricia Anderson of the UWI, has in effect substantiated this with statistical evidence. She states, "In April 1995, the unemployment rate for teenage workers with

no secondary education stood at 38.3 per cent, as compared with 49.5 per cent for those with 4 or more years of secondary schooling" (Anderson 1997:39). The pattern continued up to age 24. By contrast, among females there was a positive correlation between years of secondary education and employment. This apparent paradox is explained by the demand for low-skilled male labour, which acts as an incentive to drop out of school, or, at least, as a disincentive to continue in school. For what would be the point of CXC certification if it cannot ensure employment? Dr Anderson concludes that the type of male training offered by school system has to be more closely linked with labour market opportunities.

There were yet other reasons for education being unattractive to boys. In her recently completed study of 'Gender Differences in Participation, Opportunities to Learn and Achievement in Education in Jamaica', Dr Hyacinth Evans, also of the UWI, found that although boys and girls entered Grade I with more or less similar abilities, by Grade 5 or 6, more girls than boys were chosen to sit the Common Entrance Examination. "Teachers", she explained, "had a lower expectation for boys than girls, and through their discourse, displayed gender bias which in the overwhelming majority of cases favoured girls" (Evans 1998:8). But she also found that while girls were generally more interested in nearly all subjects, boys showed greater responsiveness to "activity-based methods and to those that require some problem solving", and to topics "which tapped their knowledge and experience" (Evans 1998:10). As a result, male identity with academic work was poor. Forty per cent of boys reported that if a boy wanted to be popular and respected he could not be serious about school, while nearly one-quarter of them thought that boys who studied hard were strange.

In short, these two studies establish that, for a combination of reasons having to do with the structure and content of academic

work as well as with labour market demands, boys do not find school a place where they like to be. But can the school system be made attractive to the male?

One way, as suggested by Dr Anderson, is to make school more responsive to the labour market. Were this to be done, however, it would meet only one, albeit very important, need in the construction of male identity, the provider role. The school system, particularly at the secondary level, can do more, if we are prepared to broaden our own ideas about what a secondary education is designed to do.

Up to the present, and looking beyond the turn of the millennium, we have seen education in general as a means to an end, not an end in itself. We send our children to school not so much that they be self-fulfilled by being educated but that they study to become professionals-the doctors, engineers, lawyers, people who earn a large income. It is fair to say that this has been the motive of our rural forebears throughout the post-emancipation years of the nineteenth century and right up to the present. The middle and upper-middle classes with origins in the black rural folk are an example of how worthwhile the effort and the sacrifice have been.

But there is another aspect to education that we have neglected, and that is its teleological function. Here education is not just a means to the end of upward mobility, but an end in itself. To realize one's potential one must be part of a society but to be able to realize one's full potential as a unique human being, one must be educated. The function of education is to make us more human. It is therefore an important aspect of the socialization process. All sociologists recognize this. But socialization is the inevitable requirement of beings who, because they are born without behavioural instincts must therefore undergo transitions from being less to being more social. The notion of transition has been part of the heritage of humankind from time immemorial, and all known

societies observe rituals of transition to confirm the social status of persons at important junctures in their life cycles. One of the most significant is the ritual of transition from childhood to adulthood—the puberty ritual. At some point close to or after the onset of puberty, a child underwent a rite, at the end of which the child was confirmed as an adult. Puberty rituals conferred on girls the status of women, who could now be given in marriage and on boys the status of men. This does not mean that they then proceeded to marry and have social intercourse with adults, but it gave them the right to do so. The story of Jesus at age twelve being lost to his parents in the Temple is the story of what happened after his puberty ritual, the bar mitzvah. Only after undergoing the ritual was he qualified to sit with adult men, the elders. That he chose them, rather than his own age group was on account of his precocity. Puberty rituals are still quite common in West Africa, the ancestral land of Afro-Jamaicans and common also in India, the ancestral land of Indo-Jamaicans.

A ritual or rite is the symbolic enactment of a state or order of being. According to Arnold van Gennep, all rituals of transition (*rites de passage*), observe three well-defined moments: separation, liminality and re-integration. In a male puberty ritual, the boys are physically separated from the community in some secluded area that is off-limits to females, under the guidance of one or more adult men, whose function it is to instruct them. During this period, their status is liminal. No longer boys, they are not yet men, and may therefore be subject to deprivations and humiliation and undergo various forms of testing. At the end of this period, which could last for days or weeks or months, depending on the particular society, they put on the garb of men and are re-integrated into the society, amidst festivities. In Jamaica, slavery, premised on the destruction of the social life of the Africans, severely curtailed the traditional rituals of transition but could not eliminate them altogether. Death rites, the transition to ancestor status, remain as they do in Ghana and other parts of West

Africa, socially the most significant of the rituals of transition, but there are also practices surrounding birth that are remnants of birth rituals once practiced in parts of Jamaica. Of puberty rites, however, there are none. For girls pregnancy functions remarkably like a ritual of transition-the affective and sometimes physical separation from the home, the liminal status which sometimes induces suicidal tendencies, then finally the re-integration as a mother like her own mother, amidst the happy welcome of a grandchild, a niece or a nephew. But for boys, nothing. They undergo no event, real or symbolic, to signal their transformation into manhood. Manhood must be fought for and won. For many boys, it comes only when they begin to work and contribute to the household, for others when they earn the right to their own key to the house, and still others when their paternity over some neighbour's daughter's baby is acknowledged.

Adolescence is itself a period of transition from childhood to adulthood. We could call it a long period of liminality. One of the difficulties facing our adolescents is the way the transition is structured. First it exacerbates the contradiction between nature and society. Nature tells them they are ready for reproduction, but society tells them they are not. This could be tolerable, were it not so long-lasting. Society tells them they need to spend an increasingly longer span of years acquiring an education, while Nature quietly speaks to them at increasingly earlier ages. Add to that the social context in which the constraints on sexual behaviour are weak and sexual stimulation is an omnipresent feature of daily life. During this period of transition the adolescent is biologically an adult, but socially a child, subject to and dependent on others.

As a recognized institution overseeing that period of transition, the secondary school could, it seems to me, serve to enact the ritual transformation, so that the students who enter as boys leave as men. But for this to happen, three things are required. First, teachers would have to see their role as helping boys to make the

transition to manhood. The objective of this aspect of the socialization process would then be not only to give them the foundation on which to build careers as professionals or skilled people later on, but also to help them acquire a sound sense of self, based on who they are but fired by who they could become. The teacher thus becomes a mentor, the wise guide, instructor and confidant, helping a child through the transition. Second, what we consider education would have to be broadened to embrace as many as possible of the defining characteristics of manhood in our current social context, if only to contend with them. The concept of education could be expanded to include exercises in the ways of accessing personal power-through the art of self-defense and self-control, grooming and fashion-consciousness, responsible sexuality and gender relations, the art of music appreciation and word-power, leadership and responsibility, home-making and financing, and so many other ways, including sports, that contribute to the social definition of manhood. Some of these could be built into the curriculum; others instituted as co-curricular education. Graduation then becomes the ritual re-integration into the community as men. And here the third requirement would trip in-the concurrence of parents and the wider community that they no longer have boys but men. A male could not be accorded the status of being a man until and unless he gained a secondary education. The message to a boy would be this: If you want to be a man, you must go to school-and complete, at least, the secondary level.

Rituals are a necessary part of social life. We cannot live without them altogether. The need to insert them into the education system is so strong among Jamaicans that it is taken to extremes. Even basic schools now hold a graduation ceremony. Given this impulse, graduation from secondary school could take on far greater significance than is already invested in it. One of the reasons secondary schools in Jamaica attract such strong loyalty from their alumni, who retain life-long bonds of friendship, could

very well be the fact that they were the sites where boys became men.

Nice ideas, one might say, but we could all die at the hand of some young gunman by the time high schools become rites of passage institutions. Do we have to wait for this to happen before we begin to see a softer, caring, more refined and socially responsible type of young man? The answer is no. In any case it is unrealistic to hold the schools alone responsible for such an enormous project. All the major public institutions, service, sports, economic, NGOs, have to be engaged, as many now are, each in its own way attempting to address at national and community levels what everyone agrees is an urgent social problem. The Area Boy Project in downtown Kingston is a commendable example. So too is the Change From Within Project initiated by the University of the West Indies and now being introduced in the schools and training colleges. But I would recommend that the problem of crime demands a special focus.

According to the ESSJ reports, over seventy per cent of the murders and shootings regularly take place in Kingston and St Andrew and the adjacent parish of St Catherine-the Kingston Metropolitan Region, in fact. And not simply the Kingston Metropolitan Region. The police are very specific-the western region of the Corporate Area has the highest concentration. This is where most of the marginalized inner city communities are to be found. The reports further identify the population bearing the main responsibility for these crimes - the youth, that is males between fifteen years and thirty years old, sometimes as low as thirteen.

The problem can be addressed by targeting this population and, given our understanding of their peculiarities as young males, co-opting and bringing them "in from the cold" and from the margins. Kingston has enormous but unexploited potential as a cultural capital. Its natural harbour, backdrop of mountains, historic

buildings, art galleries, Institute of Jamaica, institutions of higher learning, theatres, gardens (what is left of them) and people constitute a veritable gold mine. Its bustling street markets along Heywood and Princess Streets and Spanish Town Road to the Coronation Market are living studies of culture many a visitor would pay to experience. Kingston is still the reggae capital of the world, with some of the finest world-class musicians and recording studios. But it is probably the only major capital in the wider Anglophone, Francophone and Hispanic Caribbean without a tourism market. One of the major reasons for this is, without doubt, the high level of crime. Even those of us living within Kingston itself are so contained within our own grilled prisons passing for homes and our security-guarded communities as to be unable to exploit the rich culture of our own city. Few uptown housewives care to venture to shop in the downtown markets as they once did in Saturday morning rituals, meeting and gossiping with their bonded country-higglers and handcart men. The Ward Theatre, an icon of the performing arts, has become a victim of the fear and paranoia unleashed by the youth.

But what if the male youths of Kingston were to be sold the idea that, inasmuch as they now own and control the city, they could exploit its rich cultural heritage by offering it as a tourism destination? In this they themselves have much to offer, for they are among the country's most creative people. There is far more wealth to be gained by tourism, gained in greater peace and safety and shared in a more extensive reach than by drug trafficking, extortion racket and robbery. The idea in fact calls for a community tourism focus, since the product is not, as on the north coast, the sea and the sun but people-their past heritage and present accomplishments, their joie de vivre and hospitality. People, local and foreign, would pay handsomely for that. Crime as such would not thereby cease for, even in the best of times and the safest of places, robberies and murders do take place, but they do not leave the rest of the population feeling exposed and vulnerable. For this

to happen, though, the youths have to buy into it. They would have to own and control the product. This is not beyond them. We have only to recall their extraordinary level of volunteerism and community building in the 1970s.

Targeting and co-opting the male youth of Kingston could transform our inner-city communities at the margin of the mainstream from derelict eyesores into centres of recreation and learning. The result could be the transformation of gunmen and shata into creative and productive men, and the dawn of a new era of peace for Jamaica. After all, it is always in the margins that prophets and visionaries appear, and from the margins that societies are renewed.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the help of several persons who have made this essay possible. Mrs. Janet McFarlane of the Statistical Unit of the Ministry of Education and Culture was most generous with her time, while my colleagues at the University, Pat Anderson, Janet Brown, Hyacinth Evans, Errol Miller and Elsa Leo-Rhynie, were most helpful in their comments on an earlier draft. I thank Marsha Dennis for lightening my burden by helping to prepare the tables and Leeta Hearne for her incisive editing suggestions. Thanks also to the Grace, Kennedy Foundation for the challenge. I have benefited tremendously from the insights and experiences of my wife, an educator herself, and thank her and my daughters for their continued support

References

ANDERSON, Patricia. 1997. Youth Unemployment in Jamaica: Report to the ILO Caribbean Office. Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of the West Indies, Mona.

AUSTIN-BROOS, Diane. 1998. *Jamaica Genesis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

BAILEY, Wilma, Clement Branche, Gayle McGarrity and Sheila Stewart. 1996. Family and the Quality of Gender Relationships in the Caribbean Final Report. Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, Mona.

BROWN, Janet and Barry Chevannes. 1998. Why Man Stay So: An Examination of *Gender Socialization* in the Caribbean. University of the West Indies, Mona.

BROWN, Janet, Patricia Anderson and Barry Chevannes. 1991. The Contribution of Caribbean Men to the Family. University of the West Indies, Mona. Unpublished.

CHAMBERS, Claudia and Barry Chevannes. 1991. Report on Six Focus Group Discussions. Sexual Decision-making Project. UCLA and UWI

CHEVANNES, Barry. In press. *Learning to be a Man: Culture, Gender and Socialization in some Caribbean Communities*. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press.

EVANS, Hyacinth. 1998. 'Gender Differences in Participation, Opportunities to Learn and Achievement in Education in Jamaica'. University of the West Indies. Unpublished.

FIGUEROA, Mark. 1996. Male Privileging and Male Academic Performance in Jamaica. Paper delivered at a Symposium, "The Construction of Caribbean Masculinity: Towards a Research Agenda". Centre for Gender and Development Studies, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine.

FIGUEROA, Mark and Sudhanshu Handa. 1996. Female Schooling Achievement in Jamaica: A Market and non-Market Analysis. Department of Economics, University of the West Indies, Mona. Unpublished.

HALL, Douglas. 1989. *In Miserable Slavery: Thomas Thistlewood in Jamaica, 1750-86*. Warwick University Caribbean Studies Series. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.

MILLER, Errol. 1986. *Marginalization of the Black Jamaican Male*. Kingston: Kingston Publishers.

----1991. *Men At Risk*. Kingston: Jamaica Publishing House, Ltd.

----1996. Gender and Democratization of Caribbean Education. *Caribbean Journal of Education*, Volume 18 (1), April.

TOULIS, Nicole. 1997. *Believing Identity: Pentecostalism and the Mediation of Jamaican Ethnicity and Gender in England*. Oxford and New York: Berg

TABLE 1

**Baby-father's Reaction to Pregnancy
of Women Centre Clients and Controls**

| | CLIENTS (%) | CONTROLS (%) |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Babyfather stood by babymother during pregnancy | 75.4 | 79.2 |
| Babyfather gave material support during pregnancy | 88.8 | 89.7 |

TABLE 2

**Baby-father's visits during pregnancy
of Women Centre Clients and Controls**

| | CLIENTS (%) | CONTROLS (%) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| We lived together | 3.1 | 4.1 |
| Every day | 46.3 | 58.2 |
| Few times a week/at weekends | 18.1 | 11.0 |
| Now and then | 15.4 | 13.0 |
| Never saw him | 9.3 | 7.5 |
| Only once | 4.4 | 2.1 |
| Once a week | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| Other | 1.2 | 0.7 |
| TOTAL | 100.0 N = 228 | 100.0 N = 145 |

TABLE 3

**Reason Baby-father visited
once a week or less**

| | CLIENTS (%) | CONTROLS (%) |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| He lived in another area/parish | 23.0 | 22.9 |
| He denied/doubted paternity | 12.2 | 13.3 |
| Family pressure (from one or both sides) | 12.2 | 11.4 |
| He wasn't interested | 12.2 | 11.4 |
| I told him not to come | 12.2 | 5.7 |
| Relationship and problems | 10.8 | 11.4 |
| Other | 17.4 | 23.9 |
| TOTAL | 100.0 N = 74 | 100.0 N = 35 |

TABLE 4**Current Relations of Women Centre
Clients and Controls with Baby-fathers**

| | CLIENTS (%) | CONTROLS (%) |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Social friend | 31.7 | 25.3 |
| Not on good terms | 26.1 | 18.5 |
| Still my boyfriend | 21.7 | 31.5 |
| Stranger | 12.2 | 11.0 |
| Common-law husband | 3.5 | 11.6 |
| Planning to get married | 2.6 | 0.7 |
| He died | 0.9 | 1.4 |
| Legal husband | 0.4 | - |
| Hide and lick | 0.4 | - |
| Not sure | 0.4 | - |
| TOTAL | 100.0 N = 231 | 100.0 N = 145 |

TABLE 5

**Attrition Rates of the 1986-87 Cohort
Grade 1 through Grade 11**

| GRADE | MALE | | | | | FEMALE | | | | |
|-------|---------|------|-------|-------|------|---------|------|-------|-------|------|
| | E | R | E-R | A | AR | E | R | E-R | A | AR |
| 1 | 28385 | 2299 | 27086 | | | 27416 | 1556 | 25860 | | |
| 2 | 28298 | 737 | 27561 | (475) | | 27175 | 405 | 26770 | (910) | |
| 3 | 27448 | 512 | 26936 | 625 | 2.3 | 27169 | 301 | 26868 | (98) | |
| 4 | 26798 | 521 | 26277 | 659 | 2.4 | 25843 | 353 | 25490 | 1378 | 5.1 |
| 5 | 25744 | 649 | 25095 | 1182 | 4.5 | 25685 | 420 | 25265 | 225 | 0.9 |
| 6 | NO DATA | | | | | NO DATA | | | | |
| 7 | 25231 | 206 | 25025 | 70 | 0.3 | 25478 | 121 | 25357 | (92) | |
| 8 | 24550 | 184 | 24366 | 659 | 2.6 | 25454 | 156 | 25298 | 59 | 0.2 |
| 9 | 23235 | 629 | 22606 | 1760 | 7.2 | 24098 | 458 | 23640 | 1658 | 6.5 |
| 10 | 16261 | 461 | 15800 | 6806 | 30.1 | 18485 | 311 | 18174 | 5466 | 23.1 |
| 11 | 13108 | | | | | 15391 | | | | |

E - Enrolment R - Repeaters A - Attrition AR - Attrition Rate

TABLE 6

Average Rate of Attendance of 1986-87 Cohort
through to Grade 5

| YEAR / GRADE | | PRIMARY | | ALL-AGE | |
|--------------|---|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| | | MALE | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE |
| 1986-87 / 1 | U | 77 | 76 | 64 | 69 |
| | R | 65 | 67 | 59 | 64 |
| 1987-88 / 2 | U | 76 | 78 | 68 | 72 |
| | R | 65 | 69 | 69 | 64 |
| 1988-89 / 3 | U | 78 | 81 | 70 | 74 |
| | R | 76 | 78 | 71 | 69 |
| 1989-90 / 4 | U | 77 | 80 | 70 | 73 |
| | R | 78 | 76 | 68 | 70 |
| 1990-91 / 5 | U | 71 | 74 | 66 | 71 |
| | R | 64 | 68 | 56 | 62 |

Table 7

**CARIBBEAN EXAMINATION COUNCIL: NUMBER OF CANDIDATES SITTING
& PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1, 2 & 3 AT THE GENERAL PROFICIENCY LEVEL
BY SEX
1996/97**

| SUBJECT | SEX | NUMBER SITTING | NUMBER ATTAINING GRADES 1&2 | PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1 & 2 | NUMBER ATTAINING GRADE 3 | PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1,2&3 |
|-----------------|-----|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Agriculture | M | 182 | 88 | 48.4 | 80 | 92.3 |
| Science | F | 247 | 111 | 44.9 | 123 | 94.7 |
| (Double Award) | T | 429 | 199 | 46.4 | 203 | 93.7 |
| Agriculture | M | 136 | 97 | 71.3 | 37 | 98.5 |
| Science | F | 200 | 116 | 58.0 | 70 | 93.0 |
| (Single Award) | T | 338 | 85 | 25.3 | 55 | 41.7 |
| Agriculture | M | 61 | 40 | 65.6 | 19 | 96.7 |
| Science | F | 119 | 73 | 61.3 | 39 | 94.1 |
| (Crops & Soils) | T | 180 | 113 | 62.8 | 58 | 95.0 |
| Art | M | 420 | 292 | 69.5 | 78 | 88.1 |
| | F | 176 | 127 | 72.2 | 53 | 102.3 |
| | T | 596 | 419 | 70.3 | 131 | 92.3 |
| Art & Craft | M | 212 | 122 | 57.5 | 67 | 89.2 |
| | F | 237 | 119 | 50.2 | 72 | 80.6 |
| | T | 449 | 241 | 53.7 | 139 | 84.6 |
| Biology | M | 1050 | 370 | 35.2 | 523 | 85.0 |
| | F | 1806 | 654 | 36.2 | 848 | 83.2 |
| | T | 2856 | 1024 | 35.9 | 1371 | 83.9 |
| Building | M | 255 | 194 | 76.1 | 44 | 93.3 |
| Technology | F | 17 | 12 | 70.6 | 4 | 94.1 |
| | T | 272 | 206 | 75.7 | 48 | 93.4 |
| Caribbean | M | 1774 | 1005 | 56.7 | 456 | 82.4 |
| History | F | 2913 | 1988 | 68.2 | 559 | 87.4 |
| | T | 4687 | 2893 | 63.9 | 1015 | 85.5 |
| Chemistry | M | 827 | 314 | 38.0 | 327 | 77.5 |
| | F | 1112 | 401 | 36.1 | 438 | 75.4 |
| | T | 1939 | 715 | 36.9 | 765 | 76.3 |
| Clothing | M | 27 | 27 | 100.0 | 0 | 100.0 |
| & Textiles | F | 916 | 871 | 95.1 | 43 | 99.8 |
| | T | 943 | 898 | 95.2 | 43 | 99.8 |

SOURCE: Caribbean Examination Council

TABLE 7 (continued)

**CARIBBEAN EXAMINATION COUNCIL: NUMBER OF CANDIDATES SITTING
& PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1, 2 & 3 AT THE GENERAL PROFICIENCY LEVEL
BY SEX
1996/97**

| SUBJECT | SEX | NUMBER SITTING | NUMBER ATTAINING GRADES 1&2 | PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1 & 2 | NUMBER ATTAINING GRADE 3 | PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1,2&3 |
|------------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Craft | M | 30 | 13 | 43.3 | 10 | 76.7 |
| | F | 64 | 38 | 59.4 | 18 | 87.5 |
| | T | 94 | 51 | 54.3 | 28 | 84.0 |
| Electrical / Technology | M | 438 | 152 | 34.7 | 177 | 75.1 |
| | F | 37 | 11 | 29.7 | 20 | 83.8 |
| | T | 475 | 163 | 34.3 | 197 | 75.8 |
| Electricity / Electronics | M | 725 | 331 | 45.7 | 299 | 86.9 |
| | F | 59 | 19 | 32.2 | 23 | 71.2 |
| | T | 784 | 350 | 44.6 | 322 | 85.7 |
| English Language | M | 8829 | 2085 | 23.6 | 3415 | 62.3 |
| | F | 15337 | 5206 | 33.9 | 5666 | 72.2 |
| | T | 24166 | 7291 | 30.2 | 9281 | 68.6 |
| English Literature | M | 1983 | 749 | 37.8 | 887 | 82.5 |
| | F | 4510 | 2490 | 55.2 | 1583 | 90.3 |
| | T | 6493 | 3239 | 49.9 | 2470 | 87.9 |
| Food & Nutrition | M | 229 | 132 | 57.6 | 54 | 81.2 |
| | F | 2009 | 1476 | 73.5 | 363 | 91.5 |
| | T | 2238 | 1608 | 71.8 | 417 | 90.5 |
| French | M | 74 | 29 | 39.2 | 33 | 83.8 |
| | F | 369 | 118 | 32.0 | 124 | 65.6 |
| | T | 443 | 147 | 33.2 | 157 | 68.6 |
| Geography | M | 1730 | 876 | 50.6 | 714 | 91.9 |
| | F | 1526 | 844 | 55.3 | 573 | 92.9 |
| | T | 3256 | 1720 | 52.8 | 1287 | 92.4 |
| Home Management | M | 81 | 64 | 79.0 | 11 | 92.6 |
| | F | 1388 | 1085 | 78.2 | 266 | 97.5 |
| | T | 1469 | 1149 | 78.2 | 279 | 97.2 |

SOURCE: Caribbean Examination Council

TABLE 7 (continued)

**CARIBBEAN EXAMINATION COUNCIL: NUMBER OF CANDIDATES SITTING
& PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1, 2 & 3 AT THE GENERAL PROFICIENCY LEVEL
BY SEX
1996/97**

| SUBJECT (cont'd) | SEX | NUMBER SITTING | NUMBER ATTAINING GRADES 1&2 | PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1& 2 | NUMBER ATTAINING GRADE 3 | PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1,2&3 |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Information Technology | M | 652 | 342 | 52.5 | 174 | 79.1 |
| | F | 922 | 424 | 46.0 | 297 | 78.2 |
| | T | 1574 | 766 | 48.7 | 471 | 78.6 |
| Integrated Science (Single Award) | M | 480 | 318 | 66.3 | 138 | 95.0 |
| | F | 821 | 468 | 57.0 | 289 | 92.2 |
| | T | 1301 | 786 | 60.4 | 427 | 93.2 |
| Mathematics | M | 9094 | 1891 | 20.8 | 2079 | 43.7 |
| | F | 14813 | 2224 | 15.0 | 2984 | 35.2 |
| | T | 23907 | 4115 | 17.2 | 5063 | 38.4 |
| Mech. Eng. Tech | M | 272 | 167 | 61.4 | 77 | 89.7 |
| | F | 8 | 6 | 75.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| | T | 280 | 173 | 61.8 | 79 | 90.0 |
| Metals | M | 328 | 187 | 57.0 | 116 | 92.4 |
| | F | 14 | 7 | 50.0 | 7 | 100.0 |
| | T | 342 | 194 | 56.7 | 123 | 92.7 |
| Office Procedures | M | 1581 | 822 | 52.0 | 568 | 87.9 |
| | F | 6489 | 3667 | 56.5 | 2057 | 88.2 |
| | T | 8070 | 4489 | 55.6 | 2625 | 88.2 |
| Principles of Accounts | M | 3664 | 1258 | 34.3 | 1359 | 71.4 |
| | F | 9144 | 3099 | 33.9 | 3382 | 70.9 |
| | T | 12808 | 4357 | 34.0 | 4741 | 71.0 |
| Principles of Business | M | 3680 | 1566 | 42.6 | 1133 | 73.3 |
| | F | 8868 | 3749 | 42.3 | 2669 | 72.4 |
| | T | 12548 | 5315 | 42.4 | 3802 | 72.7 |

SOURCE: Caribbean Examination Council

TABLE 7 (continued)

**CARIBBEAN EXAMINATION COUNCIL: NUMBER OF CANDIDATES SITTING
& PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1, 2 & 3 AT THE GENERAL PROFICIENCY LEVEL
BY SEX
1986/87**

| SUBJECT (cont'd) | SEX | NUMBER SITTING | NUMBER ATTAINING GRADES 1&2 | PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1 & 2 | NUMBER ATTAINING GRADE 3 | PERCENTAGE ATTAINING GRADES 1,2&3 |
|------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Physics | M | 1057 | 304 | 28.8 | 469 | 73.1 |
| | F | 736 | 281 | 38.1 | 323 | 81.8 |
| | T | 1795 | 585 | 32.6 | 792 | 76.7 |
| Religious Education | M | 424 | 229 | 54.0 | 156 | 90.8 |
| | F | 861 | 727 | 82.5 | 127 | 96.9 |
| | T | 1305 | 956 | 73.3 | 283 | 94.9 |
| Shorthand | M | 11 | 1 | 9.1 | 4 | 45.5 |
| | F | 280 | 80 | 28.6 | 76 | 55.7 |
| | T | 291 | 81 | 27.8 | 80 | 55.3 |
| Social Studies | M | 1221 | 601 | 49.2 | 353 | 78.1 |
| | F | 3422 | 1947 | 56.9 | 903 | 83.3 |
| | T | 4643 | 2548 | 54.9 | 1256 | 81.9 |
| Spanish | M | 531 | 211 | 39.7 | 155 | 68.9 |
| | F | 1422 | 775 | 54.5 | 386 | 81.6 |
| | T | 1953 | 986 | 50.5 | 541 | 78.2 |
| Typewriting | M | 302 | 81 | 26.8 | 153 | 77.5 |
| | F | 3092 | 1093 | 35.3 | 1417 | 81.2 |
| | T | 3394 | 1174 | 34.6 | 1570 | 80.8 |
| Technical Drawing | M | 2332 | 1577 | 67.6 | 616 | 94.0 |
| | F | 213 | 133 | 62.4 | 70 | 95.3 |
| | T | 2545 | 1710 | 67.2 | 686 | 94.1 |
| Woods | M | 570 | 490 | 86.0 | 60 | 96.5 |
| | F | 28 | 20 | 71.4 | 7 | 96.4 |
| | T | 598 | 510 | 85.3 | 67 | 96.5 |

SOURCE: Caribbean Examination Council

TABLE 8
Gender Biases in CXC Subject Areas, 1993-1996

| MALE SUBJECTS | 1993 | | 1994 | | 1995 | | 1996 | |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------|----------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| Building Tech. | 182 | 21 | 207 | 18 | 195 | 16 | 255 | 17 |
| Elec. Tech. | 348 | 28 | 415 | 27 | 499 | 25 | 438 | 37 |
| Elec. / Elec. | 400 | 21 | 466 | 45 | 471 | 36 | 725 | 59 |
| Mech. Eng. | NO DATA | | NO DATA | | 283 | 11 | 272 | 8 |
| Metals | 271 | 6 | 309 | 7 | 314 | 10 | 328 | 14 |
| Tech. Drawing | 1749 | 128 | 1888 | 156 | 1924 | 158 | 2332 | 213 |
| Woods | 356 | 14 | 367 | 11 | 412 | 19 | 570 | 28 |
| TOTAL | 3306 | 218 | 3652 | 257 | 4098 | 275 | 4920 | 376 |

TABLE 8 (continued)

| FEMALE SUBJECTS | 1993 | | 1994 | | 1995 | | 1996 | |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| Clothing | 686 | 11 | 730 | 19 | 722 | 21 | 916 | 27 |
| Craft | 73 | 14 | 44 | 10 | 71 | 27 | 64 | 30 |
| Food & Nutrition | 1428 | 123 | 1782 | 128 | 1683 | 127 | 2009 | 229 |
| French | 338 | 61 | 338 | 73 | 340 | 83 | 369 | 74 |
| Home Mang. | 987 | 47 | 1189 | 69 | 1186 | 61 | 1888 | 81 |
| Office Practice | 3221 | 760 | 3265 | 901 | 3335 | 886 | 6489 | 1581 |
| Religious Educ. | 457 | 119 | 627 | 122 | 785 | 318 | 881 | 424 |
| Shorthand | 341 | 3 | 278 | 9 | 204 | 6 | 280 | 11 |
| Social Studies | 1774 | 571 | 2319 | 778 | 2437 | 747 | 3433 | 1221 |
| Spanish | 1098 | 303 | 1340 | 356 | 1327 | 410 | 1422 | 531 |
| Typing | 2626 | 240 | 2554 | 277 | 2364 | 243 | 3092 | 302 |
| TOTAL | 13079 | 2252 | 14466 | 2742 | 13598 | 2584 | 14543 | 2224 |

TABLE 9

Enrollment in the College of Arts, Science & Technology
by Department, Sex & Year

| SUBJECTS | 1990-91 | | 1992-93 | | 1993-94 | | 1994-95 | | 1995-96 | | 1996-97 | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| Building | 256 | 72 | 310 | 80 | 374 | 85 | 408 | 87 | 446 | 86 | 544 | 110 |
| Architecture | 50 | 22 | 64 | 34 | 80 | 36 | 86 | 37 | 69 | 43 | 70 | 42 |
| Commerce | 787 | 1622 | 647 | 1555 | 621 | 1452 | 606 | 1418 | 574 | 1694 | 594 | 1789 |
| Carpentry | 111 | 157 | 363 | 343 | 389 | 304 | 618 | 527 | 628 | 607 | 568 | 620 |
| Engineering | 1100 | 31 | 263 | 47 | 1095 | 52 | 59 | 1070 | 1075 | 57 | 983 | 55 |
| H & F. Sc. | 54 | 281 | 45 | 392 | 49 | 399 | 70 | 418 | 77 | 447 | 68 | 509 |
| Sc. & H. Sc. | 157 | 315 | 153 | 310 | 139 | 309 | 127 | 309 | 128 | 313 | 146 | 320 |
| Tech. Ed. | 141 | 315 | 187 | 400 | 140 | 421 | 167 | 379 | 171 | 416 | 218 | 486 |
| TOTAL | 2657 | 2815 | 2733 | 3161 | 2887 | 3058 | 2141 | 4245 | 3169 | 3663 | 3192 | 3937 |

TABLE 10
UWI Enrolment by
Gender and Faculty, 1990-96

| YEAR | ADMISSIONS | | A | | E | | L | | M | | N | | S | |
|------|------------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| 1990 | 412 | 750 | 103 | 337 | 12 | 32 | 7 | 16 | 4 | 5 | 194 | 196 | 92 | 164 |
| | | | 25.0 | 44.9 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 47.1 | 26.1 | 22.3 | 21.9 |
| 1991 | 449 | 854 | 71 | 274 | 14 | 54 | 10 | 30 | 28 | 37 | 166 | 177 | 160 | 279 |
| | | | 15.8 | 32.1 | 3.1 | 6.3 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 6.2 | 4.3 | 37.0 | 20.7 | 35.6 | 32.7 |
| 1992 | 510 | 875 | 60 | 313 | 21 | 58 | 10 | 25 | 34 | 32 | 228 | 202 | 157 | 245 |
| | | | 11.8 | 35.8 | 4.1 | 6.6 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 44.7 | 23.1 | 30.8 | 28.0 |
| 1993 | 487 | 911 | 81 | 328 | 14 | 59 | 8 | 22 | 26 | 30 | 216 | 151 | 142 | 321 |
| | | | 16.6 | 36.0 | 2.9 | 6.5 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 5.3 | 3.3 | 44.3 | 16.6 | 29.1 | 35.2 |
| 1994 | | | N | | O | | D | | A | | T | | A | |
| 1995 | 529 | 1163 | 72 | 322 | 27 | 125 | 4 | 28 | 27 | 32 | 207 | 186 | 192 | 470 |
| | | | 13.6 | 27.7 | 5.1 | 10.7 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 39.1 | 16.0 | 36.3 | 40.4 |
| 1996 | 506 | 1195 | 65 | 321 | 38 | 146 | 5 | 34 | 9 | 22 | 190 | 185 | 199 | 487 |
| | | | 12.8 | 26.9 | 7.5 | 12.2 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 37.5 | 15.5 | 39.3 | 40.8 |

FACULTIES

A - Arts

E - Education

L - Law

M - Medicine

N - Pure & Applied Sciences

S - Social Sciences

TABLE 11
UWI Graduates by Gender and Class
Of Degree, 1990 - 98

| YEAR | 1 st CLASS | | UPPER SECOND | | LOWER SECOND | | PASS | | TOTAL | |
|---------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| 1990-91 | 8 3.4 | 9 1.9 | 60 12.8 | 137 29.3 | 106 45.7 | 223 47.8 | 58 25.0 | 98 20.1 | 232 | 467 |
| 1991-92 | 19 5.4 | 27 3.6 | 97 27.7 | 236 31.4 | 132 37.7 | 320 42.6 | 102 29.1 | 165 22.0 | 350 | 751 |
| 1992-93 | 22 6.1 | 37 5.2 | 110 30.6 | 253 35.9 | 139 38.7 | 290 41.1 | 87 24.2 | 125 17.7 | 359 | 705 |
| 1993-94 | 20 5.0 | 33 3.8 | 102 24.6 | 308 35.6 | 183 44.2 | 360 41.4 | 107 26.1 | 164 19.0 | 414 | 865 |
| 1994-95 | 26 6.1 | 59 6.9 | 116 27.2 | 335 35.6 | 156 36.6 | 381 40.5 | 129 30.0 | 164 17.4 | 426 | 940 |
| 1995-96 | 29 7.0 | 69 | 110 26.7 | 349 34.8 | 159 38.6 | 407 40.5 | 112 26.8 | 175 17.4 | 412 | 1004 |
| 1996-97 | 25 5.7 | 49 4.7 | 89 20.4 | 352 33.7 | 180 41.3 | 426 40.8 | 142 32.6 | 216 20.7 | 436 | 1043 |
| 1997-98 | 23 5.7 | 58 5.1 | 111 26.4 | 382 33.5 | 155 36.8 | 467 41.0 | 130 30.9 | 232 20.4 | 420 | 1139 |

TABLE 12

**Arrests for Major Crimes in
1996 and 1997 by Age and Type**

| AGE | MURDER | | ROBBERY | | RAPE | | SHOOTING | |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 1996 | 1997 | 1996 | 1997 | 1996 | 1997 | 1996 | 1997 |
| <16 | 8(2.0) | 8(1.6) | 68(2.9) | 30(2.2) | 51(6.2) | 19(2.9) | 11(1.3) | 6(0.8) |
| 16-20 | 77(20.2) | 111(22.5) | 430(18.2) | 267(19.7) | 140(16.9) | 79(11.9) | 238(27.1) | 195(29.6) |
| 21-25 | 143(37.4) | 141(29.1) | 860(36.5) | 416(30.7) | 210(25.4) | 165(24.8) | 326(37.2) | 260(36.8) |
| 26-30 | 76(19.9) | 125(25.3) | 710(30.1) | 338(24.9) | 180(21.8) | 144(21.7) | 132(15.1) | 145(20.5) |
| 31 > | 78(20.5) | 109(21.5) | 290(12.3) | 306(22.5) | 228(29.7) | 358(38.7) | 170(19.3) | 101(12.3) |
| TOTAL | 382(100.0) | 494(100.0) | 2358(100.0) | 1357(100.0) | 826(100.0) | 665(100.0) | 877(100.0) | 707(100.0) |