Socialization and Teacher Expectations of Jamaican Boys in Schools:
The Need for a Responsive Teacher Preparation Program

Christopher Clarke
University of South Florida

Introduction

What are little boys made of?
Snips and snails and puppy dog tails
That's what little boys are made of.
What are little girls made of?
Sugar and spice and everything nice,
That's what little girls are made of.

—Nursery Rhyme.

Going by the above nursery rhyme, boys enter life with a disadvantage. This statement is only true if one accepts the view of this single nursery rhyme. Nursery rhymes, however, do not really capture the essence of boys and girls. Reality paints a different picture. Boys are the favored gender. In recent times however, they and their education and anti-social behaviors have become the focus of international attention. Some writers claim that they are being marginalized, emasculated and feminized, while others say they need reform. A debate has been raging for more than a decade now.

I am joining the discussion long after it got started in the 1990s. In fact it is correct to say that I came upon the discussion after it intensified

Address all correspondence to: Christopher Clarke, College of Education, University of South Florida, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, Tampa, Florida 33620. E-mail:

in the 1990s. I will declare what I bring to the debate. I am a black Jamaican male educator. As a boy growing up in Jamaica, I experienced social injustice. I was never the stereotypical male and received a lot of flak and suffered much humiliation from that. I have been mentoring teenage and adult males for over twenty years. I have taught both boys and girls, have been seen as a role model by many, and for ten years I taught pre-service and in-service teachers (mostly females). I have often heard these teachers express concern about the performance and behavior of the boys they teach. I too am concerned, and recent statistics provide me with no comfort. My pursuit of this issue is mainly to find answers, not to join a backlash movement as some feminists might think. These are the identities I bring to this quest for answers. I wish to point out at the outset that a disaggregation of the data on changing patterns of male/female school performance rejects the essentializing of girls and boys and young men and young women in the debate. Not all boys are underachieving and not all girls are doing better than all boys in school. What is revealed by the data is that although girls as a group are doing better than boys as a group, middle class boys are doing better than other boys and better than lower class girls. It is also true that working class girls as a group are doing better than their male counterparts. It means therefore that it is working class boys more than any other that are underachieving. It is important therefore to understand how they are socialized and a specific component of that socialization is the expectations teachers have for them in schools. The response of teacher preparation programs is also critical to finding solutions to the problems facing boys.

Purpose and Rationale of Paper

This paper is intended, therefore, to present a review of the literature on the socialization and teacher expectations of Jamaican boys as well as an examination of how teachers are being prepared to address the gender issues that are implied. It is also hoped that the paper can contribute to the search for possible policies and pedagogical strategies that might be useful in challenging boys to reconsider the effects of hardcore masculinity in their lives and especially at school. The paper will show that the social construction of gender is an important consideration in developing curriculum and managing student behavior. This is because the ways in which many boys construct their gendered identities impacts significantly on their participation and engagement with school, both in terms of their performance and the way they behave and relate to others. The effects can be far-reaching because many boys' ways of acting out masculinity and what it means to be a 'real man' have consequences, not

only for the boys themselves, but for everyone else at school, their families and the wider society. Boys' participation, performance and achievement can suffer, but they can also disrupt the learning and working environment of the classroom and school, which impacts negatively on other students' learning and school work. In addition, restricted notions of masculinity often prevent boys from taking emotional and sexual responsibility for their lives and the lives of others even in the face of an increase in the numbers of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. The fear of not being a 'real man' often leads to a contempt for risk-reduction behaviors. Pursuing these notions of masculinity traps many boys in severely limited subject, curricular, and work choices and damages the range of their emotional lives and social relationships. It is in this sense that the socialization of boys viz- a- viz dominant constructions of masculinity needs to be examined as an educational issue. The paper is organized in four sections. In the first section, a description of the underachievement thesis is provided followed by a description of the Jamaican context which provides the background for the third section—an analysis of the socialization and expectations of boys in school. In the final section teacher preparation in Jamaica is examined in terms of its responsiveness to the socialization of boys and girls.

Boys in Trouble: An International Phenomenon

According to the following excerpts taken from newspapers, research, and opinion journalism, the "problem" boys face is like a time bomb waiting to go off.

> As we enter the next millennium it is the underachievement of boys that has become one of the biggest challenges facing society. (Ted Wragg, *Times Educational Supplement*, May 1997)

> Boys are on a path to illiteracy, crime and prison. (*Jamaica Observer*, July 14, 2002)

> Boys today are in serious trouble… (they) are faring less well in school than they did in the past and in comparison to girls, many boys have remarkably fragile self-esteem, and the rates of both suicide and depression are both frighteningly on the rise. Many of our sons are currently in a DESPERATE CRISIS. (Emphasis added) (Pollack, 2000, p. xix)

> [T]eenage boys in Jamaica are alienated, depressed and often suicidal; they nurture bizarre theories about sexuality and are sitting ducks for HIV, hard drugs, and criminal behavior… (John Maxwell, *Jamaica Observer*, July 14, 2002)

Supporting the claims of these writers are the following statistics:

◆ In 2002 the average scores for girls in the Jamaican Grade Six Achievement Test (GSAT) were eight percentage points higher than those for boys in all five subjects.

◆ At the secondary level (Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate and Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination) male achievement was generally lower than that of females in 2001.

◆ At Mona, the largest of the three campuses of the University of the West Indies (UWI) women outnumber men in enrolment two to one.

◆ Adolescent males are four times more likely than adolescent females to commit suicide.

◆ The majority of adolescent alcoholics and drug addicts are male.

◆ Five out of six children and adolescents diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) are boys.

◆ Boys are three to four times more likely than girls to have a learning/reading disabilities placement in schools.

◆ Boys in elementary through high schools score significantly lower than girls on standardized measures of reading achievement.

◆ Jamaican boys have a higher school attrition rate than girls do.

From the quotations and statistics above one gets a picture that there is a 9-1-1 crisis on our hands. The situation is not unique to Jamaica. In the United States of America, Britain, and Australia, boys' education has come in for attention. At the same time, girls, thanks to second-wave feminism, are doing better than they were 20-30 years ago. This is not to say that every boy is under-achieving or that every girl is achieving. Indeed, when the data are disaggregated, the intersection of race, class, and gender reveals that ethnic minorities and lower class students (boys and girls) are the ones with the greatest disadvantage (Lindgard & Douglas, 1999; O'Day & Smith, 1993; Kozol, 1991). Research in Australia shows that even girls from low socio-economic groups perform better in English than boys from higher socio-economic groups (Lindgard & Douglas, 1999). In the United Kingdom, Gillborn (1997) has found that at the secondary level African Caribbean boys were frequently among the lowest achieving of all groups. Sewell, in a study of a school in London reports that in some parts of South London 60% of black youth cannot find employment on leaving school. This group is not homogenous. He

identified four sub-groups. The largest (41%) make friends across ethnic boundaries and are not in conflict with the school. They do, however, find it difficult both to conform to the norms of the school and maintain good relations with all their Afro-Caribbean peers. The second group (31%) is in a state of conflict. On one hand they accept the aims of schooling largely through parental influence, but reject the means, the actuality of their experience of school. The third group (6%) was labeled by Sewell as retreatist. They do not enter into the ethos or activity of school but they make no overt resistance. They spend the day aimlessly hanging around the corridors, trying to avoid attention. The fourth group (12%) were described as the overt rebels who largely socialized with other Afro-Caribbean youths and resist schooling.

Miller (1991) and Parry (2000) describe the situation in Jamaica where there is widespread concern about the marginalization of young males. Miller who initiated the marginalization theory, cites statistics from Jamaica to show females overtaking males at all levels of the education system. For example, the figures reveal that from as far back as 1938 girls overtook boys in high school enrolment, and the decline of men at the tertiary level began as far back as 1908. Miller goes on to assert that "while other Caribbean countries may show differing times when girls and women surpassed boys and men at different levels of the education system, the pattern is the same throughout the region" (p. 79). Figures for 2001 show that the enrolment gap continues to widen in favor of women. At the University of the West Indies (UWI) a mere 30% of the students enrolled were males and over 75% of those who graduated were females. Females outnumbered males in every faculty except in Engineering and Agriculture. At the University of Technology male enrolment was also in decline (Planning Institute of Jamaica, PIOJ 2001).

In her study of boys in Barbados, St. Vincent, the Grenadines, and Jamaica, Parry (2000) found that not only were boys underachieving in comparison to girls at the secondary level but also the boys seem to have a very rigid, macho sense of masculinity that expresses itself in contempt for teachers, who are largely female. The situation in Jamaica was characterized as particularly grave. Evans (1999) in a study in secondary schools in Jamaica found boys to hold more negative attitudes towards school work than did girls. Boys' behavior was "in stark contrast to that of girls" (p.28). Teachers on the other hand, described girls as conforming, participating, doing their work, and sitting quietly. Parry too found an anti-academic male sex/gender identity existing among boys which was not compatible with either diligent study or good grades. The Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (often referred to as CXC) is the major "passport" to tertiary education and work in the Caribbean. An analysis

of the subject-choice of students by Evans showed that only one subject (English Language) was pursued by more than 50% of the boys in the sample. Ironically, it is the subject in which they generally perform the worst. Interest in subjects that traditionally were dominated by boys (Physics, woodwork, technical drawing, chemistry) was also low. Girls' interest in the subjects ranged from 1.8 % (Technical Drawing) to 87% (English Language). In 13 of the 16 most commonly taken subjects girls' participation was well over 50%. The gender differences in choice were statistically significant in all but two of the 16 subjects. At the University of the West Indies, the premier tertiary institution in the Caribbean, the ratio of females to males was seven to one. At the primary level, figures from Jamaica (PIOJ, 2001) reveal that girls are also doing better than boys in the Grade Six Achievement Test (GSAT)—the examination used to select students to some of the most prestigious secondary high schools in the country. Shepherd (2002) more recently also supported the underachievement thesis.

In the United Kingdom, Gillborn (1997) reports the findings of a national survey of performance at age 16 conducted during the mid 1980s, disaggregated for race class, gender, and ethnicity. This survey revealed that irrespective of gender and ethnicity, the higher the social class the better the performance across the three groups classified as 'black', 'Asian,' and 'white.' Black students were not doing as well as white students nor as well as those of Pakistani, Bangladeshi, or Indian origin. For blacks, the girls did better than the boys in each of the respective family occupational categories used in the research. Boys of other minorities did better than their female counterparts.

In the United States, based on a study done by Coley (2001), the pattern is similar. Coley studied the results of a representative sample of elementary and secondary students on the various tests of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) over the last decade. Although he found more similarities than differences between male and female performances, females did better in reading and writing across all racial and ethnic groups. Overall, ethnic minority females performed better, stayed in school longer, took advanced programs to get into college and went on to complete four years of college at a higher rate than the males in those groups. The Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute (1997), in what has been described as "the most creative pulling together of disparate data sources (on African Americans) seen any-where" by William Wilson of Harvard University, documents several items of data on the performance and behavior of African American students at all levels of the education system. This data set reveals, among other findings, that in the United States of America (USA) black

boys were less prepared for school than their female counterparts (in terms of having books, paper and pencil, and doing homework) and were less likely than black girls to be a member of an academic club, honor society, student government, or other school club. Townsend (2000) cites evidence to show that black students, especially boys, are suspended and expelled more often than any other group. They also receive exclusionary forms of discipline at two to three times their percentage in the general school age population. In addition, according to sources cited by Townsend (2000) and Gay (2000) black students, especially boys are disproportionately relegated to special education and remedial education classes. Developing countries like Jamaica can ill-afford to have any significant portion of their population marginalized.

Social and Economic Conditions in Jamaica

Jamaica is the largest of the English-speaking countries in the Caribbean, occupying an area of 10 990 km.^{2} Of its 2.62 million population (2001 estimates) those under the age of 18 years constitute 38.7 %. Females (50.4 %) and males (49.6%) are almost equally distributed in this portion of the population. Life expectancy at birth in Jamaica is 72 years (69.8 for males and 73.2 for females) while the crude birth rate is 21.2 per 1000 for the population (2001). The total fertility rate has been declining since 1998 (PIOJ, 2001). As a measure of the health status of the population, these rates compare favorably with those of developed countries.

In 2001 the average size of a Jamaican household was 3.4 persons with adult males, adult females, and children equally distributed. In the poorest 80% of the population, however, the figure was 5.23 while the wealthiest 20% had the lowest household size with 2.26 members. Based on its life expectancy rate, its literacy rate of 80% and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita of $2,650 (US) Jamaica has been placed among those countries with medium levels of human development by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Unemployment figures give cause for concern. Although twice as high(21%) among females, that rate is declining while that for men (10.3%) has been increasing since 1999 (PIOJ 2001). At the same time almost 45% of all households were headed by females, in most instances without an adult partner and with the likelihood of more children than their male counterpart.

Improved early childhood care and education for persons birth to eight years in Jamaica have been promoted and supported by government and the non-governmental community. This is due largely to the increasing recognition of the vital role it plays in providing the foundation for social and academic development of the child. Enrolment at this level

has shown a steady increase over the years and now stands at 91% of the age cohort. There is almost universal enrolment at the primary (elementary) level (99%) with average daily attendance of 83% (female attendance being marginally higher). Approximately 95% of children 11-18 years are enrolled in secondary education. Like at the other levels attendance for girls is higher than that for boys. Almost 21% of the population was enrolled at the tertiary level in 2001, women again were in higher numbers generally. In 2001 the government allocated 10.8% of its budget to education. Of this amount 95% went to recurrent expenditure, 70% to salaries alone. Among the sectors, early childhood education had the largest increase (25 %)over the previous year. Despite the level of increase that sector remains the poorest of all.

The Jamaican economy is heavily dependent on foreign trade, particularly in manufactured goods, food and fuel. As a large service-based economy in which service accounts for over 60% of GDP, the distributive trade, transportation, financial services, and the tourism industry are the major service sectors. In addition remittances from North America and the United Kingdom have played a significant role in the economy. According to 2001 figures growth in real GDP was 1.7%, an improvement despite how miniscule the figure appears. The economy has been anemic for several years and like many others is only now recovering from the slump in international economic activity particularly in the United States. While its foreign debt has shown a decline, Jamaica's domestic debt continues to increase at a worrisome rate. Approximately 60 cents of every Jamaican dollar is now needed to service its debt. Poverty estimates show that one-third of the population live in poverty. A half of those living in poverty are children under 18 years of age. The implications for development are obvious. There are numerous social problems: poverty, crime and violence, unemployment, migration of professionals and a decline in moral values and attitudes are like rain clouds constantly hanging over an already saturated ground. This is the context in which boys and girls grow up. These are some of the conditions they face. It is within this context that the socialization and teacher expectations of boys are examined. Given the fact, however, that Jamaican boys share similar circumstances with boys elsewhere it is useful to consider two theories on why boys behave the way they do before analyzing how they are brought up in Jamaica.

Two Perspectives on How It Happened

The debate about boys' poor school performance and anti-social behavior is largely between two perspectives on gender and sexuality: the

essentialist's and the social constructionist's. Advocates of the former, see gender as prescribed, that is, they believe that one's gender behavior is largely predetermined. Gender is in the brain (Gurian, Henley, with Trueman, 2001; Dobson, 2001; Moir & Gessel, 1990; Kimura, 1992). The latter group sees gender as ascribed, that is, it is socially constructed through various gender discourses (Miller 1991; Connell, 1996; Mac An Ghaill, 1994; Francis; Young, & Brozo, 2001; Chevannes, 2001). While the essentialists see most of boys' behavior as driven by hormones, social constructionists consider them as learned. Boys are not born masculine or feminine.

Proponents of essentialism expound the biological and psychological differences between boys and girls. According to that school of thought these differences in how the male and female brains are wired indicate that boys and girls have different learning styles and should therefore be treated differently (Gurian, 2001; Dobson, 2001; Sommers, 2001). Different learning styles speak to the notion of gender-fairness (Hyun, 2001). This means that boys and girls should be treated differently. Sexton (1969), had long argued that boys were not getting a fair deal in schools because of the preponderance of female teachers. Instead they were being "feminized." These socio-biological advocates also point to: the absence of positive role models for boys at home and in schools, the later maturing of boys, and the pressure from feminists and feminism for boys to discard, what Pollack (1998) refers to as "the boy code"—a stereotype image of what it means to be a man. These, according to essentialists are factors contributing to the anti-social behaviors and underachievement of boys.

It is not clear what the essentialists want for boys. If indeed they are creatures largely of nature, short of biological engineering (Miller, 1991), they are unchangeable, and their behaviors are to be blamed not on factors external to them. The essentialists also need to explain why boys in all societies do not behave and under-perform at the levels cited here. While there is some evidence (Head, 1999; Gilligan, 1982) that there is a learning style difference between males and females, it is inconclusive; there is no fixed style for either. Styles are determined by the task being done. To resolve the perceived disadvantage boys have been put at, essentialists argue for a "male repair agenda" (Lindgard & Douglas, 1999, p. 133). Such an agenda seeks to reaffirm masculine identities and create a sense of community among men and boys. In schooling this translates into calls for a greater masculine presence in schools: more male teachers, more masculine literature, more active modes of learning and a greater involvement of fathers in their sons' education. "Through these initiatives it is envisaged that boys will be able to define their identities positively in relation to masculine influences rather than negatively in

opposition to the preponderance of female teachers and to a feminized curriculum and pedagogy" (Lindgard & Douglas, 1999, p. 133). Biller (1974) suggests that the preponderance of female teachers in schools discriminate against boys in the early years of schooling. According to them most elementary (and preschools) schools are dominated by women with a ratio of female teachers to male teachers at about 6:1 and more than 50:1 in the first few grades. As a result, boys may come to see academic achievement as a feminine pursuit, especially if they do not have an involved father or father figure who values education. In addition, during the preschool and elementary school years, many boys may be inhibited by the lack of male role models. In the field of early childhood education there is a preponderance of female teachers. This institutionalized feminine bias is believed to promote a certain degree of discomfort for boys given that obedience is usually valued and teachers generally discourage assertiveness- a trait common to boys (Hyun, 2001).

Partially because of the feminized classroom, girls may learn to read more quickly than boys. Female teachers typically will pay more attention to girls, giving them more oral reading time than they do boys. Also, since a same-sex adult role model encourages girls, they are likely to become more interested in reading. Head (1999) cites the situation in Japan where about 60% of the elementary teachers are male, and where reading scores for boys and girls are about equal. In Germany where the majority of elementary teachers are male, and reading is considered a masculine talent, boys consistently achieve higher reading scores than girls and are less likely to suffer from severe reading problems.

These expressions for a greater presence of males and less of females in the lives of boys are echoed in the Caribbean. In the Caribbean single parent female-headed households are prevalent and classrooms at the pre-tertiary levels reveal a preponderance of female teachers. These situations are compounded by a high incident of absentee fathers, many of whom take no part in the raising of their children. While there may be value to having male role models in the form of more male teachers, it has not been made clear as to how these models would be selected, neither has there been any evidence given that males make better teachers for boys or that single sex schools benefit boys. On the contrary, research has consistently shown that girls benefit far more than boys from single-sex classes (Lee & Bryk, 1986; MacMillan, 1981; Riordan, 1985) and attracting men back into the classroom has proven problematic— teaching is still stigmatized as women's work and too low paying to attract the 'right kind of men.' The argument that female teachers put boys at a disadvantage is not supported by research. Female teachers, like their male counterparts have often shown bias in favor of boys

(Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Many female teachers prefer teaching boys and often generate more effort in doing so (Parry, 2000). In the Parry study, male teachers indicated a clear preference for teaching girls because "they were more motivated and less disruptive" (p. 27). Foster, Kimmel, and Skelton (2001) however, argue that it is not the school experience that feminizes boys and prevent them from achieving, "but rather the ideology of traditional masculinity that keeps (them) from wanting to succeed" (p.14). Traditional masculinity is what is referred to in the literature as hegemonic masculinity. It is explained further in the following paragraphs.

Hegemonic Masculinity

Most of the literature on the underachievement and anti-social behaviors of boys has been written from a feminist/social constructionist perspective. This literature overwhelmingly points to hegemonic masculinity or the confusion that results from the multiplicity of masculinities that play themselves out at school and in the wider society as the major factor in boys' underachievement and anti-social behavior (Young & Brozo, 2001; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Parry, 2000; Connell, 1996; Miller, 1991, Chevannes, 2000). There is no longer one form of masculinity for every one. Masculinities are constructed in relation to one's class, social, and ethnic contexts. They do not have a one-dimensional identity. For example, there are white, gay masculinities, black, middle class, bi-sexual; and black, lower class, heterosexual masculinities. There are also African, Chinese, and Indian masculinities.

Hegemonic masculinity is only one form of expression of what it means to be a man. Over time, according to Connell (1996) it has come to be the dominant form in Western societies. In the hierarchy of masculinities it is at the apex. Hegemonic masculinity as it is in Gramsci's analysis of social class relations is about power, privilege, and status. It has come to be seen as that singular definition of what it means to be a man. According to Donaldson, in practice hegemony appears normal and natural and therefore the State and the greater part of the population, through popular culture, the media and other social institutions, punish for non-conformity. It is also about sexuality, heterosexuality to be specific. Donaldson (1993) says "heterosexuality and homophobia are the bedrock of hegemonic masculinity… (it is) violent, pseudo-natural, tough, contradictory, and crisis-prone" (p. 645). According to Sedgewick (1991), "homophobia is used to police the boundaries of acceptable heterosexual male behavior and identity" (p.33). Being a man, according to this brand of masculinity, is defined in opposition to what it is to be feminine. Boys

seem to internalize this idea before they even start school and therefore regard anything remotely different as feminine, and consequently, to be resisted. This resistance is sometimes typified by a refusal to do well in such subjects as Reading, English and foreign languages which are seen as girls' domains. As one boy puts it, "Most boys who like English are funny (faggots)" (personal communication). Or, as another boy in the study by Parry sarcastically says, "Real men do not like reading." Perhaps no other characterization of hegemonic masculinity is more apt than William Pollack's Boy Code. The code requires boys who want to be considered as real men to demonstrate four caricatures of masculinity:

> 1. "The Sturdy Oak." Men should be strong (physically and emotionally), silent and self-reliant. Showing emotions and being too kind are seen as breaking the rule.

> 2. "Give 'Em Hell." The world of competitive sports and the on-screen conduct of such hyper-masculine models such as Arnold Schwarzenegger, Bruce Lee, and Sylvester Stallone promote an enormity of daring violent and over-the-top attitudes and behaviors in boys.

> 3. "The Big Wheel." This ideal motivates boys and men to achieve status, power, and dominion over others, including an assumption of sovereignty over girls and all things feminine.

> 4. "No Sissy Stuff." This is regarded as the most traumatizing aspect of the Code because it inhibits the expression of any feelings and desires that may be construed as feminine, such as dependence, warmth, and empathy. (Pollack 23-24).

This is the set of unwritten rules of hegemonic, heterosexual masculinity.

Hegemonic masculinity as it relates to underachievement plays itself out in four ways, each of which speaks to the socialization of boys. Firstly, the gendered curriculum allows certain subjects/disciplines to be considered feminine and therefore not consonant with real manliness. The attitude of many boys to English, Reading, and Foreign Languages already mentioned illustrates the point. In Jamaica many boys also eschew participation in secondary school subjects such as Typing and Shorthand, Home Economics, and Office Practice. Reading is integral to an optimum participation in other disciplines and to avoid it is to reduce one's chance of success in school work.

Secondly, academic success requires commitment and conformity to school practices such as good behavior, obeying school rules, obedience to authority, spending time on task and an acceptable level of preparedness for school work. Some boys see these as running contrary to being masculine and display anti-social behaviors instead. Their anti-social behaviors often exclude them from participating in the educational

process (Chevannes, 1999). They are often (sometimes unjustifiably) dismissed from a class, suspended and even expelled from school (Townsend, 2000).

Thirdly, boys deliberately under-perform in order to remain popular and masculine. Kerr and Kohn in their research among gifted minority boys found that many of the boys hide and deny their giftedness "in order to maintain a masculine façade" (p. 320. See also Pollack, 1998). They also found that many of the boys they interviewed "avoid activities, organizations or even classroom discussions in which girls play major roles in order to protect their male image" (p.320). To work hard in school is not sufficiently macho for many Jamaican boys. The evidence is that most of these boys have a desire to do well but are afraid lest they upset the status quo of their peer group (Ogbu, 1986). Peer culture can be as harmful as it can be helpful.

Finally, conformity to the tenets of hegemonic masculinity including the practice of homophobia, not only increases the level of anxiety about being socially ostracized, but also dictates boys' range of social, emotional, and academic experiences in school. The inability to explore and embrace other possibilities of manhood reduces the options and opportunities boys can have and need at school. Instead of doing some of the things regarded as girlish, many boys spend their time interrogating their own behaviors or policing other boys' behaviors in order to "toe the line" of hardcore, toxic masculinity. In my experience in teaching boys, many of them long to do some of the so-called girls' things (e.g., playing 'girl' games, cooking, doing classical dancing, working hard) but fear the reprimand and ridicule of other boys. At a time when globalization is further eroding traditional low-skilled jobs and requiring greater levels of literacy for the simplest of paid work, boys are reducing their options to become employable. How did our boys become like this? What is there in their socialization process that could lead to this undesirable state of affairs? Barry Chevannes, Jamaican sociologist says "What we sow we reap." The paper now examines the raising of boys in Jamaica.

Socialization of Jamaican Boys

In a situation where one or two persons out of a population are deviants the explanation for the deviance would focus on the formation of personality. But in a situation where an entire section of a population is deviant, the focus must inevitably be directed to processes that shape the foundations of behavior. With the exception of biological functions human behaviors are acquired by social intercourse with a collective. This process through which we construct our foundations of behavior is

what is called socialization. Socialization therefore, is an interactive process, in which each individual internalizes the meanings, values, and behavioral norms of a collective. Evans and Davies (1997) regard socialization as the process that more than any other influences the development of any society. According to them "Socialization toward the desired or ideal mores and norms facilitates the creation of a civil society, and allows members to live satisfying lives, in respectful relationships with one another" (p. 2).

The family, church, school, media, and peer groups are the most significant agents of socialization in Jamaica. In addition to learning values and norms, Bailey and Parkes (1995) correctly point out that a critical dimension of children's early development is the acquisition of differentiated gender identities and the internalization and acceptance of corresponding sex-linked behaviors and roles. Young children learn at a very early age the difference between boys and girls and this differentiation goes beyond their anatomies. Although the focus of the paper is on what happens at school it is also instructive to consider if only briefly, how boys are socialized outside the confines of the school.

Parents and other household members have very clearly defined roles and guidelines for raising boys and these are often very different from those for girls. While career roles may not be prescribed in the early years, gender roles are. Girls are seen as "easier to raise" and will "provide help in the home," and care for parents "in old age" (Brown and Chevannes, 1995). These researchers also report from community discussions as part of a larger study in Jamaica and elsewhere in the Caribbean that at home chores are assigned along gender lines to fit the philosophy of "tie the heifer, loose the bull." Consistent with this philosophy, girls do household and childcare tasks inside the house while boys are assigned "heavy" work outdoors. Washing dishes, bathing younger siblings, cooking are considered girls' and women's work while taking care of the outdoors, washing the family vehicle, tending animals are reserved for boys and men. Boys are raised to become providers while girls are expected to become nurturers.

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 behavioral 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. Boys, as soon as they are able to, resist such simple tasks as washing dishes and keeping the house tidy. At home boys leisure activities engage them with older boys and young adult males in sports, street corner games and chats, bike

riding and other such physical activities often outside of the immediate home environment. Girls on the other hand, are restricted to more circumscribed activities—playing with dolls at home or playing at school and before dark. Girls are more likely to be reprimanded for "playing too much" and told to "go take a book" meaning they should do something academic. Boys are likely to be stigmatized as effeminate if they stay indoors too often. At home also boys are punished more severely to "toughen" them and enable them to survive in the rough outside world. Physical affection is largely reserved for girls; boys are not to be "petted." This is part of the "toughening" process as well as to prevent them from becoming homosexuals. Homophobic myths are prevalent in Jamaica and boys who are seen as acting "like a girl" are the butt of jokes, reprimands, and even face ostracism.

Toys too are selected along gender lines by both parents and children. According to Leo-Rhynie (1995), from a study conducted across a sample of toy purchasers and children from all social classes, toys were bought to enhance the gender of the children for whom they were intended. Some purchasers even avoided buying certain toys for boys because "I don't want him to be a sissy" (p. 258). When the researcher offered "sex-inappropriate" toys to some of the children "they all indicated very emphatically, that this would not be acceptable." The boys found the idea of a doll for Christmas hilarious asking "Are you for real?" (p. 258). The study also found that retailers use the sex of child consumers as a major factor in the grouping display and offer of toys for sale.

Outside the home the peer group virtually replaces parents as the controlling agents or if not entirely a substitute, a countervailing force. According to Chevannes (1999) an adolescent boy's friends "exact an affinity and a loyalty as sacred as the bond of kinship, as strong as the sentiment of religion" (p. 30). They socialize one another. The older members of the group act as the transmitters of what passes as knowledge, invent new knowledge and meanings.

The church is another powerful socializing force in Jamaica. Some religions support gender separation, male dominance, and female subjugation. They selectively quote particular portions of the Bible to support their thesis that the natural or divine value of the woman lies in her roles as child-bearer, child-rearer, and helpmate in the service of her male partner. The man is head of the household and the woman is subject to him. Generally speaking men and women accept the teachings of the religions to which they adhere and thus, promote and perpetuate the beliefs of that religion. In situations where the teachings conflict with the realities of day-to-day living adherents often deviate from what is preached and some struggle with a sense of guilt. Children also receive

conflicting messages from what they hear at church and what is practiced at home and in their communities. By and large however, the church's message is consistent with the status quo.

Boys and Girls in Schools

Girls by virtue of their earlier development are more likely to start school at an earlier age than boys. At the primary level, however, 2001 figures show boys accounting for 51.1% of the enrolment. Children spend between five and eight hours a day at school. As boys and girls go to school they take with them the values learned at home and from peers. The same is true of their teachers. 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. In fact it is not uncommon to hear parents express delight at the return of their children to school after a holiday break or a stoppage for some other reason. Boys however, are often at a disadvantage where school attendance is concerned. They have a lower attendance and a higher attrition rate than girls If resources do not allow for the children to attend school all at the same time, girls are given the advantage over boys. This, according to Chevannes (1999) is seen as part of the toughening of the boy. Necessity is made into a virtue. The boy must learn to survive. The sight of boys on the streets "begging a lunch money" is a growing concern. Many drop out of school and make begging a full time activity. This is particularly true in the cities and urban areas. Many boys according to Chevannes, cannot guarantee their 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.

There is a dearth of comprehensive research on what goes on in Jamaican classrooms. Most studies have focused solely on academic behavior and more often than not conducted in secondary schools. Other studies were too dated to be included here. This paper therefore draws heavily from two reports by Evans and Davies (1997) and Evans (1999). The research by Evans, although the most comprehensive of its kind to date, is also confined to secondary schools. What is known about socialization in schools at the lower levels is left to speculation.

At school, many of the gender stereotypes learned earlier are reinforced by both male and female teachers. As at home, boys and girls are treated differently at school. Evans and Davies (1997) point to evidence to show that boys are treated more harshly than girls mainly because girls "are more compliant and follow rules more willingly" (p. 19). Anecdotal and observational reports according to these researchers

indicate that girls in general are more likely to adhere to the norms of the school and are consequently given more responsibility in the classroom by teachers who are overwhelmingly female. Evans and Bailey opine that the reason for this could be that the skills and the sense of responsibility that the girl develops in the home are recognized and utilized in the classroom. Presumably, boys do not develop skills at home that can be utilized at school. More recent research by Evans (1999) show that boys, more than girls fooled around in class—joking, chatting to other boys, and even playing. Evidence of the male peer culture was found even in classrooms. One gang member explained that a gang member's anti-social behavior in class is often imitated by another. If most members were "idling" for example, and others wanted to work, the latter would have to refrain from doing so lest they be seen as "odd ones out." Not all boys idle however and the research does find evidence of boys showing high level of interest in schoolwork depending on the topic of discussion or the activity to be done. Boys were more interested in discussing practical life issues or discussions about sports and participating on more hands-on activities. According to Evans boys sometimes refrained from participating for fear of being humiliated. Some teachers used boys' poor reading ability to shame them.

On the playgrounds it is boys who control the lager spaces. By virtue of the games they play they dominate the playground. Cricket and soccer are games that require big spaces and girls know they should keep out of the areas where these are being played. Boys also engage in more rough and tumble games, more horsing around and often get into conflict with other boys sometimes leading to fights. These observations are consistent with those made by Thorne (1993) in his study of schools in the United States. Another feature of playground interaction is the separation of the sexes. Boys play among themselves and girls do the same. Occasionally there is mixed-group play or participation in cross-gender activities. Boys seen playing with or among girls are viewed suspiciously. Girls who show interest in traditional boys' activities are simply considered tomboys. They suffer no negative consequences. In fact there is now an active girls' soccer competition among secondary high schools in Jamaica. Whether inside or outside the classroom boys and girls are socialized along gender lines and even in the expectations teachers have of the two groups. The interaction among students as well as that between teachers and students are powerful means of socialization.

Teacher Expectations: How it Works and Who it Affects

Teachers' expectations are influential in the way students behave

academically and socially (Grayson & Martin, 1984). Good (1982) further suggests that teachers routinely model and communicate expectations likely to affect not only achievement, but students' attitudes, beliefs, attributions, expectations, achievement motivation, and classroom behavior. Expectations are shown through eye contact, touch, facial expression, vocal tone, and gesture. After reviewing more than 130 studies on teacher expectancy, Harris and Rosenthal (1985) concluded that, when teachers hold positive expectations towards a student, these teachers "tend to display a warmer socio-emotional climate, express a more positive use of feedback, provide more input in terms of the amount and difficulty of the material that is taught, and increase the amount of student output by providing more response opportunities and interacting more frequently with the student" (p.377). I believe that of all achievement variables teachers' expectations have, arguably, the most profound impact on student behavior and performance.

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) asserted in a controversial study that teachers' expectations for student performance act as self-fulfilling prophecies. Brophy and Good (1970) explained how this works:

> (a) The teacher forms differential expectations for student performance;

> (b) He/she then begins to treat children differently in accordance with his/her differential expectations for student performance;

> (c) The children respond differentially to the teacher because they are being treated differently by the teacher;

> (d) In responding to the teacher each child tends to exhibit behavior that complements and reinforces the teacher's particular expectations of him/her;

> (e) As a result, the general academic and social performance of some children will be enhanced while that of others will be depressed;

> (f) These effects will show in the achievement (measures) given at the end of the year, providing support for the "self-fulfilling prophecy" notion.

In the Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) research no observation was done. The researchers reasoned that the expectations they created about the children and communicated to the teachers somehow caused the teachers to treat them differently, so that they really did better by the end of the year. Using this model among a group of first graders, Brophy and Good (1970) examined teacher-student dyadic interactions to see the effects of teacher expectations on children's behavior. They found, inter alia, that children for whom the teacher held high expectations (called 'highs') raised their hands more frequently and initiated more procedural and especially more work-related interactions than did children for whom

the teacher held low expectations (called 'low'); more highs showed their work to the teacher or asked her (sic) questions about it, and initiated many more response opportunities than the lows.

A vital first step is missing from the Brophy and Good model. It does not address how teachers form differential expectations in the first place. In the expectancy studies cited here, teachers were given information about, or formed, perceptions of children's abilities. They then interacted with children based on the information or their perceptions. Presumably, if teachers perceive that, or get information that boys and girls are different in abilities and social behaviors or if boys are perceived as disruptive and lack interest in schoolwork, they will have different expectations for them and encourage them accordingly. Research has shown that teachers' personal beliefs affect their attitudes and classroom practices (Bledsoe, 1983; Cahill & Adams, 1997; Fagot, 1984; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Hyun (2000) also asserts that people's stereotypical perceptions about others affect their real social interactions. Based on their stereotypical gender perceptions, for example, teachers form differential expectations of boys and girls as gender groups. Dweck and Gilliard (1975) concluded based on their research that nearly all teachers interact with their students in a gender-based fashion to some degree. This they say, leads students to understand that expectations of them are based in part on their gender. As with any kind of bias being practiced, the outcome for students is that opportunities may be limited.

Long before girls and boys leave home, however, differential expectations are held for them. Baby boys and girls are treated very differently from birth, dressed differently, and there are different expectations for them. In an experiment carried out by Sussex University (Smith & Lloyd, 1978), 32 mothers were invited to play with a baby they had never seen before. The interactions were filmed. The same baby was presented to the mothers as either "a boy" or "a girl." The women chose stereotyped toys for the baby depending on whether they were told it was a girl or a boy. When the baby "boy" became restless, it was interpreted as a wish to play, so they played with "him". When they thought it was a girl, and she started to wiggle the behavior was interpreted as an indication that "she" was upset and 'she' was soothed.

Ma (2001) cited several studies that attributed gender differences in mathematical performance to differential expectations and treatment by mathematics teachers. Good (1982) cited several teacher behaviors that indicate differential teacher treatment of high and low achievers. Among the behaviors are: Waiting less time for low achievers to answer (Bozsik, 1982), criticizing lows more often for failures (Good, Cooper & Blakey, 1980), paying less attention to lows or interacting with them less

frequently (Adams & Cohen, 1974), less friendly interaction with lows (Smith & Luginbuhl, 1976), briefer and less informative feedback to lows (Cooper, 1979), and less direct instruction and more opportunity for them to do seatwork (Allington, 1980). Over time, such differences in the way teachers treat low achievers may reduce low students' efforts and contribute to a passive learning style. There was no analysis of the data, however, in terms of gender.

Teachers' Differential Expectations of Boys and Girls

Carew and Lightfoot (1979) in a year-long study, found no evidence of race or gender discrimination among a sample of four first grade teachers. Ms. Ryan (one of the teachers) was described as having idealized expectations for how children so young should behave—expectations that seemed to cloud her appreciation of her first graders personal and social achievements. She was the only one of the four who described a majority of her first graders in predominantly negative terms even eight months into the research when she was asked to review their progress over the year. Among the children, one girl was described as "a baby… a bright little girl but who knows how to be a royal pain. Socially, she's a disaster." Kenneth, a boy, was described as "a difficult child, the 'child of the year' type of kid; he's a very demanding child, demanding of attention and time… he's definitely a child whose (anti-social) behavior interferes with his academics, he just can't sit still… he cant do without supervision or help. He's a real disruption to the class. He's no dummy. He's a bright little kid and he knows exactly what he's doing to me. He just seems to crave doing it." Ms. Ryan blames the home for the poor social skills and general negative behaviors. Of the over 80 children in the study, Ken received the highest percentage of inappropriate behavior in interaction with his teacher and received the highest percentage of negative reinforcements from her. He was the least involved in academic activities with Ms. Ryan, spent the least time in concentrated work and the most time interacting with other people, mostly chatting and playing.

Ms. Ryan's class was the only one in which there was 'evidence' of racial and sex discrimination. Although 29% of the children in her class were black and 33% were boys, no blacks and only one boy were included in her top reading group. Conversely of the 7 children in her bottom reading group four were black and four were boys. She pointed out that at the beginning of the school year, the children differed greatly in their reading readiness, motivation, and work habits and her reading groups were made entirely on this basis. These initial differences in reading ability and habits of individual black and white children, and boys and

girls, apparently effectively determined their reading group assignments for the entire year.

Hyun (2001) in a self-talk study of 31 preschool teachers, in which they shared their perceptions of two groups of children that were identified only by a list of descriptive words, found that the teachers expressed higher expectations of stress and hesitation to work with the group that was later identified as boys. On the other hand, the group identified as girls was perceived as more teachable, academic, and literate. The boys were also seen as requiring more structure and constant, close supervision. Academically, the boys were perceived as constructive, independent, creative, and active learners, although too active to remain focused on teacher-driven activities. They were therefore seen as less teachable than girls. Hendrick and Stange (1991) in their study found that teachers perceived preschool boys as more disruptive learners than were girls. None of these studies examined how the perceptions and expectations of these teachers influenced their classroom practices at the preschool level. Sadker and Sadker (1994) however, in a landmark mixed method study found boys to be excessively advantaged in schools across the United States. These researchers concluded that at home as well as in the wider society boys are the favored gender.

Teachers see girls as being more prepared to conform and more motivated (Clarricoates, 1980). Despite this, they liked teaching some boys more: "On the whole you can say boys are far more capable of learning, much nicer to teach" (p. 151). Boys were also seen as academically more capable even though girls had the highest marks. Clarricoates (1980) found that, in nursery school, boys get more attention, more teaching and instruction, more disciplining; they dominate classroom and playground space and teachers' time. Boys gained more attention than girls—their questions were answered more frequently and more quickly. Adults (aides and teachers) listened hard for boys' answers and sometimes did not hear girls' answers even the right ones. Secondly, teachers elaborated the play of boys more than that of girls. When questions arose out of play or there was the opportunity to develop a theme, teachers offered more explanation or information to boys than to girls. Boys were given longer and more thoughtful replies, girls short, simple answers. Teachers chatted socially to girls more than to boys but their interactions with boys were more complex and more likely to foster cognitive development.

Clarricoates (1980) asserted further that teachers seem to plan the curriculum and direct the content of their lessons around boys' interests. Measor and Sykes (1992) suggested that this is done to reduce disruption from boys. In order to maintain good management in the classroom

teachers felt obliged to concentrate on the boys. Dweck and Gilliard (1975) found that the teachers they studied tended to criticize boys' poor performance on an academic task for lack of trying hard enough. This form of criticism was rarely found to be directed towards girls. Teachers tended to simply tell the girls that they had not done something correctly, while the boys received additional comments about their failure to try. These researchers understood this differential treatment to mean that while boys are criticized for their lack of effort girls are criticized more for intellectual inadequacy.

The research on teacher expectations considered so far has all been conducted outside of Jamaica. As Evans and Davies (1997) admit, not much research on this aspect of school life is readily available locally. The findings cited above however are similar to those found in Jamaica based on the limited research done. Evans and Davies assert that teachers vary their expectations according to the type of school and the social class of the students. Research carried out in the upper levels of the all-age (Junior High) school—one of the schools attended by children from the lower socio-economic groups—suggests that most teachers in this type of school do not believe that students in the 7th to 9th grades have the ability to master the curriculum. These expectations are formed based on teachers' beliefs about the students' home environment, their intelligence, and lack of interest in learning. Studies (Anderson, 1980; Chambers, 1987) show that high expectations and a positive teacher-student relationship are related to high student morale, satisfaction with self and school, as well as to achievement. The data in these studies was not analyzed in terms of gender. The studies were also conducted in secondary schools. In the more recent study conducted by Evans (1999) teacher expectation was not a stated variable. Data on teacher interaction with students suggests, however, that teachers held lower expectations for boys as a group than they did for girls. For example, both boys and girls perceived that boys more than girls were unfairly treated by teachers although girls felt that the boys caused it on themselves because of their behavior; both boys and girls felt that teachers favored the girls, and both boys and girls reported that boys received far more and harsher discipline than girls. Teachers however, said they treated both boys and girls fairly. Teachers' lower expectations of boys academic ability was typified by such a statement as, "I knew you would give me the wrong answer" (p. 40). On the other hand Evans report that teachers called upon girls to answer more often than they did boys. There were instances also of teachers trying to cajole boys to participate and sometimes girls were ignored in an attempt to get more involvement from the boys.

Based on the studies reviewed here, both boys and girls have

benefited and suffered as a result of teacher expectations. Putnam and Self (1988) argue that learners discover that the expectations of them are based to some degree on their gender rather than on their individual needs or abilities. If boys are constantly made to feel incompetent and worthless the experience has been that they remove themselves from the process and develop deviant sub-cultures. Teachers need to be made aware of the power they wield through their interactions with students and particularly boys. Teacher education has an obvious role to play here. How aware are Jamaican teachers of the differential gender socialization that takes place in their classrooms daily? Are teachers being helped to confront gender inequities in their classrooms? Do teacher preparation programs in Jamaica address these issues?

The Response of Teacher Education
to the Socialization of Boys in Jamaica

At a time when schools are being blamed for nearly everything that is wrong with society, when there is call for performance-based remuneration (which really means closer supervision of and greater accountability from teachers), when there is much mistrust of teachers and curricula, it is hard to be a teacher in Jamaica. Added to this are the effects of the very real economic crisis that have plagued the schools where teachers and students work in conditions that would be laughable were they not so tragic. Yet, Jamaica boasts a cadre of excellent teachers. Approximately 82% of the teaching force are trained teachers despite the constant recruiting by countries such as the United States, Britain, and the Bahamas. Predominantly female and in their thirties, teachers spend three years of preparation time in the islands' nine teachers colleges, three universities, and teacher preparation program of one specialist college. The teachers colleges have a centrally planned curriculum, managed by the Joint Board of Teacher Education (JBTE)—a state certification agency which acts also as a quality control agency. The JBTE prepares final examinations and makes provisions for external assessment of students' work. Lecturers from the colleges however, are the ones who write the various curricula and submit items to a "bank" for examinations.

The program of pre-service preparation contains three strands: Core courses (sometimes referred to as education courses or social foundations) taken by all students, specialist courses for the various options pursued (Early Childhood, Primary, Secondary) and the practicum.

It is important to know how prospective teachers are prepared to cope with the social issues and the instructional challenges that are bound to confront them daily in the classrooms. After all, teachers are regarded as

agents of change. Besides, student teachers bring with them their own socialization into the classrooms. Houston and Warner (2000) posit that teacher preparation programs should help prospective teachers understand themselves, their values and drives prior to helping them understand their students' needs and aspirations and the effectiveness of their own instructional strategies. These writers see inquiry and reflection as means through which pre-service teachers will understand themselves. Unfortunately, while these are concepts that permeate teacher education, they have never been as pervasive as general practices. What then ought to be the aim of teacher preparation programs in light of the social contexts in which teachers work?

Tom (1996) argues that these programs are often formed in a vacuum, ignoring the political and economic contexts in which education as a whole take place. They treat relations of inequality that dominate the society, for example, as beside the point. The program of teacher preparation in Jamaica, unfortunately was guilty of this for a long time although there have been at least two revisions in the last 15 years (Brown, Yusuf-Khalil, and Bailey, 2000). A new day has dawned. Now there is a third revision taking place. What follows is a preliminary analysis of five of the core courses offered in the revised curriculum.

In an introduction to the revised curriculum (*Rethinking the practicum in the teacher education programme,* unpublished) the JBTE says the revision was a response to the reforms that had taken place in primary and secondary education. At the secondary level there was the demand for new ways of teaching: cooperative learning, grouping, student research and at the primary level teachers are now required to "integrate around themes, teaching in ways that emphasize problem-solving and creativity and using such strategies as cooperative learning, group and project work that encourage pupils and share ideas" (p.1). The document describes the changes to the teacher education program as "extensive" and says further that "we are now required to prepare a new kind of teacher." These new teachers, according to the document:

> Are expected to be student-centred, and to teach in constructivist ways. This means that they have to be able to help pupils construct their own understanding of the knowledge that they learn, and to use knowledge in new ways. They have to be more attuned to their students' thinking *and be generally aware of the experiences that their students have had* (emphasis added). They have to be able to think along with their students, detect misunderstandings and misconceptions and provide appropriate information/explanations/examples to address these misunderstandings whenever they occur. (p.1)

This vision of the new teacher is the guide to the revision of the

teacher preparation program. In the Rationale for another course (The Teacher, The School and Society) it is stated in part that the teacher plays a crucial role in the development and education of children and that "it is therefore necessary for the teachers to be aware of the social setting in which the child is reared and nurtured and in which he/she is to be educated" (p.1). This document also speaks to the "new kind of teacher" that is required. Such a teacher according to this course rationale must be one who will

◆ understand the culture of the school and the society in which it operates;

◆ be able to recognize and cope with the multiple roles he/she will need to undertake as a teacher;

◆ help in creating and maintaining a positive school culture; and

◆ be open to new insights as he/she reflects on diverse occurrences in the education arena. (p.2)

In one of the four units of this course student teachers are required to examine the culture of schools including the "diversity in schools and classrooms", and "situations that drive this diversity." There is no explicit mention of gender relations in this unit or any other units of this course. In *The Emergent Teacher*, another 30 hour core course the idea of educating diverse students is again raised and the course "seeks to provide opportunities for student teachers to examine their beliefs, assumptions, and expectations about teaching and how these influence the practice of teachers" (p.1). One of the three units is allocated eight contact hours for student teachers to explore "Understanding Gender." In this unit student teachers will "develop an understanding of attitudes to gender and sexuality and become aware of how beliefs about these areas lead to stereotyping in the classroom" (p.3) They will also

◆ Discuss common differences between the experiences encountered in the socialization of males and females and critically examine how these influence the formation of self;

◆ Make suggestions for changes that can improve experiences and learning for both genders;

◆ Explore gender, sexuality, and the implications for the social, emotional, intellectual, physical, and spiritual well being of the self;

◆ Discuss the feminization of the teaching profession and explore how this has influenced the perception people hold about teachers and the images teachers hold about themselves as professionals. (p. 7)

In still another course (*Understanding the Learner*) student teachers are not only required to understand how their own behaviors/attitudes impact students but also to learn strategies to assist students to cope with their total development. Among the objectives of this course student teachers will "develop the skills to identify and validate the needs of learners given their diverse cultural backgrounds; and "demonstrate an understanding of issues related to sex, gender, masculinities and femininities, families and caregivers and the ways in which these manifest themselves in schools and classrooms (p.8). Socialization issues are also covered in one of three courses designed exclusively for those pursuing the early childhood education option. In a 75 contact hour Child Development course student teachers discuss

◆ gender differences in learning styles and academic achievement in boys and girls;

◆ issues of male academic underachievement;

◆ absence of male role models at home and school;

◆ curriculum appropriateness and relevance to the developmental needs of boys;

◆ differences in expectations regarding boys' and girls' behavior;

◆ childhood sexuality, heterosexual and homosexual behaviors;

◆ aggression among boys;

◆ gender issues in children's play;

◆ gender stereotyping in play. (p. 13-15)

In addition to the content, reflection and inquiry are common threads running through the revised curriculum. According to the rationale for The Emergent Teacher "when student teachers engage in reflective practice and use their repertoire of past experiences to understand current dilemmas which face them in the learning situation in a constructivist manner they will be able to stimulate the same level of reflection among their students" (p.2).

Alongside this revised teacher preparation curriculum but preceding it is Brown, Yusuf-Khalil and Bailey's (2000) *Gender issues in Caribbean education: A module for teacher education*. This module was developed :

in response to the growing recognition of the imperative to mainstream gender in institutions and in public debate, and the concomitant need for specific education and training interventions in order to achieve this objective. In particular, given the central role played by the formal education system in bringing about change in society, this initiative

targeted at teacher educators and trainees, is of paramount importance. (Foreword)

The module aims to build awareness of gender and its impact on the education process and outcomes as well as to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills required to adopt and promote a gender sensitive approach to instruction and all school-related activities. The module is divided into four units: Basic Concepts in Gender Socialization, Gender Issues in Schooling, Gender Issues in Curriculum and Instruction, and Gender Issues in Education: Policy, Organization and Management. According to the authors, a basic assumption of the module is that gender equity between the sexes can be achieved in education if all teachers have a clear understanding of how gender influences the educational experiences of the sexes in unique and different ways. "Any change, however, in traditional views about what is appropriate behavior and appropriate areas of study, career paths, and so on for each sex, has to start with the teacher and with students from the earliest level of schooling" (p.iii).

The revised teacher preparation curriculum in Jamaica has incorporated salient issues and approaches to help student teachers contend with their roles in the socialization of boys (and girls). To that extent it is responsive. The Joint Board of Teacher Education has taken a social reconstructionist approach to the revision of its curriculum. Such an approach as envisioned by John Dewey

> aims to prepare individuals to take part intelligently in the management of conditions under which they live, to bring them to an understanding of the forces which a re moving them and to equip them with the intellectual and practical tools by which they can themselves enter into the direction of these forces. (Liston & Zeichner, 1991, p.39)

Conclusions

There is sufficient documentary evidence to say there is a problem among boys particularly of the lower social classes. They are in the majority in Jamaica and therefore the situation cannot be ignored. The attempt to locate the causes of the problem in the brain is not borne out by research. What the research repeatedly shows is that the way boys have been socialized prior to starting school and even while in preschool makes them sometimes resist academic work, seeing it as feminine and therefore to be avoided. The homophobic attitude that is so pervasive in the Jamaican society and that has even genderized certain courses has only exacerbated the problem of boys underperformance. The preponderance of female teachers in the early years of schooling is not the cause of the underachievement, given that they arrive at school with their gender identity at

least partially formed. Teachers do, however, treat boys and girls in stereotypical ways. These stereotypes lead teachers to have differential expectations of girls and boys, some negative and others positive.

A few other observations must be noted about the expectations research. Firstly, the studies were done more than 20 years ago. At that time the statistics and debates about boys' education were not in the public domain as much as they have been since the 90s. Given the ascendancy of girls during that time, new research is needed to determine whether expectations have changed. Secondly, the expectation studies cited here all examined classrooms or schools. What happens in class-rooms and schools is also influenced by expectations that are outside of schools. Research is needed therefore, in light of the changing education landscape to determine the effects parents' and media expectations may be having on teacher expectations as well as students' performance and behaviors. Thirdly, the study of expectation effects is a complex and challenging area. Future research is needed and careful work will yield new descriptions and concepts that can be used by teachers to think about and perhaps improve instruction (Good, 1982). Finally, if it is accepted that the preschool years are crucial to development and to change, the need for expectation studies at this level in developing countries such as Jamaica is obvious.

The response of teacher education to gender socialization in Jamaica is encouraging. Although it is way too early to hand out bouquets, it is hoped that the vision to develop a new teacher—a teacher who is not afraid of grappling with the real causes of social inequities— will become reality. But it cannot be left to the school alone to change gender inequities and re-socialize boys. Ultimately, the entire society will have to play its part in addressing not just the symptoms, but also the cause of boys' underachievement and anti-social behaviors.

References

Adams, G. & Cohen, A. (1974). Children's physical and interpersonal character-istics that affect student-teacher interactions. *Journal of Experimental Education, 43*, 1-5.

Allington, R. (1980). Teacher interruption behaviors during primary grade oral reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 371-377.

Anderson, J. (1980). *An investigation of the effect of expectations and other related variables on the achievement of grade eleven students in English and mathematics.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica.

Bailey, B. & Parkes, L. (1995). Gender, the not-so-hidden issue in language arts materials used in Jamaica. *Caribbean Journal of Education, 17(2),* 265-278.

Biller, H. (1974). *Paternal deprivation, family, school, sexuality and society.*

Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Bledsoe, J. (1983). Sex differences in female teachers' approval and disapproval behaviors as related to their self-definition of sex-role type. *Psychological Reports 2,* 711-714.

Boyzik, B. (1982). *A study of teacher questioning and student response interaction during pre-story and post-story portions of reading comprehension lessons.* Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association.

Brophy, J. & Good, T. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 61(5),* 365-374.

Brown, J. & Chevannes, B. (1995). Gender Socialization project. *Caribbean Journal of Education, 17(2),* 336-340.

Brown, M., Yusuf-Khalil, Y., & Bailey, B. (2000*). Gender issues in Caribbean education: A module for teacher education.* Kingston, Jamaica: CARICOM Secretariat.

Cahill, B. & Adams, E. (1997). An exploratory study of early childhood teachers' attitudes towards gender roles. *Sex Roles, 36(7),* 517-529

Carew, J. & Lightfoot, S. (1979). *Beyond Bias: Perspectives on classrooms.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chambers, D. (1987). *Teacher perception and expectation as correlates of student performance in Jamaican new secondary schools.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica.

Chevannes, B. (1999). *What we sow and what we reap: Problems in the cultivation of male identity in Jamaica.* The Grace, Kennedy Foundation Lecture Series, Kingston, Jamaica: Grace, Kennedy Foundation.

Chevannes, B. (2001). *Learning to be a man: Culture, socialization, and gender identity in five Caribbean communities.* Kingston, Jamaica: UWI Press.

Clarricoates, K. (1980). The importance of being Earnest, Emma, Tom, and Jane. In R. Deem (Ed.), *Schooling for women's work.* London, UK: Routledge & Keegan Paul.

Coley, R. (2001). *Differences in the gender gap: Comparisons across racial/ethnic groups in education and work.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service Policy Information Center.

Connell, R. (1996). Teaching the boys: New research on masculinity and gender strategies for schools. *Teachers College Record* 98, 206-35.

Dobson, J. (2001). *Bringing up boys.* Chicago: Moody Press.

Donaldson, M. (1993). "What is hegemonic masculinity?" *Theory and Society,* 22, 643-51.

Dweck, C. & Gilliard, D. (1975). Expectancy statements as determinants of reaction to failure: Sex differences in persistence and expectancy change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32,* 1077-1084.

Epstein, D., J. Elwood, V. Hey, & J. Maw (eds). *Failing boys? Issues in gender and achievement.* Philadelphia: Open University, 1998.

Evans, H. & Davies, R. (1999). Issues in childhood socialization in the Caribbean. In J. Roopnarine & J. Brown (Eds.) Caribbean families: Diversity among

ethnic groups. London, UK: Ablex.

Evans, H. (1999). *Gender and Achievement in Secondary Education in Jamaica.* Kingston, Jamaica: Planning Institute of Jamaica.

Foster, V., Kimmel, M., & Skelton, C. (2001) "What About the Boys? An Overview of the Debates" *What about the Boys? Issues of Masculinities in Schools.* Eds. Wayne. Martino & Bob. Meyenn. Philadelphia: Open University, 1-23, 2001.

Francis, B. (2000). *Boys, girls, and achievement: Addressing the classroom issues.* New York: Routledge Falmer.

Fredrick D. Patterson Research Institute (1997). The African American education data book (Vol.II: Preschool through high school). Fairfax, VA: Author.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* New York: Teachers' College.

Gillborn, D. (1997) Young black and failed by school: The market, education reform, and black tudents. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1, 65-87.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Good, T. (1982). How teacher expectations affect results. *American Education, 18(10)*, 25-32.

Good, Cooper, H. & Blakey, S. (1980). Classroom interaction as a function of teacher expectations, student sex, and time of year. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 378-385.

Grayson, D. & Martin, M (1984). *Gender expectations and student achievement. A teacher education program addressing gender disparity in the classroom.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 829.

Gurian, M., Henley, P. with Terry Trueman (2001). *Boys and girls learn differently.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Head, J (1999). *Understanding the boys: Issues of behavior and achievement.* New York: Falmer.

Hendrick, J. & Stange, T. (1991). Do actions speak louder than words? An effect of the functional use of language in dominant sex-role behavior in boys and girls. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6*, 565-576.

Houston, W. & Warner, A. (2000). Inquiry and reflection: Twin needs for improved teacher education. In J. McIntyre, & D. Byrd (Eds.) *Research on effective models for teacher education*, 72-77. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hyun, Eunsook. "Gender-Fair and Gender-Congruent Practices for Young Children's Naturalist Intelligence: From the Perspective of Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practices." *Paper presented at the 2001 NAEYC Conference*, Anaheim, CA, Oct. 31-Nov. 3.

Kerr, B. & Kohn, S. (2001). *Smart boys: Talent, manhood, and the search for meaning.* Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press, 2001.

Kerr, B. & Colangelo, N. (2001). *"Something to Prove: Academically Talented Minority Students." Talent Development.* N. Colangelo and S. Assouline (.Eds). Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential, 2001.

Kimmel, M. (2000, November). What about the boys? *Digest, November*, 1-2, 7-8.

Kimura, D. (1992). Sex differences in the brain. *Scientific American*, September, 119-121.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Crown.

Lee, V. & Bryk, A.(1986). Effects of single-sex secondary school on student achievement." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 78 (1986), 381-95

Leo-Rhynie, E. (1995). Girls' toys, boys' toys: Forming gender identity. *Caribbean Journal of Education, 17(2),* 248-264.

Lindgard, B.& Douglas, P. (1999). *Men engaging femininisms: Pro-feminism, backlashes and schooling.* Philadelphia: Open University.

Liston, D. & Zeichner, K. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Ma, X. (2001). Participation in advanced mathematics: Do expectations and influence of students, peers, teachers, and parents matter? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26,* 132-146.

Mac an Ghaill, M.. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities, and schooling.* Philadelphia: Open University.

MacMillan, V. (1981). *Academic motivation of adolescent Jamaican girls in selected single-sex and co-educational high schools.*" Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of the West Indies, Jamaica, 1981.

McGuire, J. (1988). Gender differences. In. N. Richman and R. Landsdown (Eds), *Problems of Preschool Children*, 173-89. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Measor, L. & Sikes, P. (1992). *Gender and schools.* New York: Cassell.

Miller, E. (1991). *Men at Risk.* Kingston, Jamaica, Jamaica Publishing House.

Moir, A. & Jessel, D. (1990). *Brain sex: The real differences between men and women.* New York: Dell.

O'Day, J.& Smith, M (1993). Systemic reform and educational opportunity" Ed. Susan Fuhrman. *Designing Coherent Educational Policy: Improving the System.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

Ogbu, J (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of being white." *The Urban Review, 18*(3), 176-206.

Parry, O. (2000). *Male underachievement in high school education.* Kingston, Jamaica: Canoe Press.

Planning Institute of Jamaica (2001). *Economic and social survey, Jamaica 2001.* Kingston, Jamaica: Author.

Pollack, W. (1998). *Real boys : Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood.* New York: Random House.

Riordan, C. (1985). Public and catholic schooling: The effects of gender context policy". *American Journal of Education*, 93, 518-546.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Sadker, M. & Sadker D (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat our girls.* New York : Touchstone

Sedgwick, E.(1991). *Epistemology of thecCloset.* London, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Sexton, P. (1969). *The feminized male : Classrooms, white collars and the decline of manliness.* New York : Random House.

Smith, C & Lloyd, B. (1978). Maternal behavior and perceived sex of infant: Revisited. *Child Development, 49(4),* 263-265.

Smith, F., & Luginbuhl, J. (1976). Inspecting expectancy: Some laboratory of relevance for teacher training. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 68,* 265-272.

Shepherd, V. (2002). *Challenging masculine myths: Gender, history education and development in Jamaica. "Dialogue for development"*. Kingston, Jamaica: PIOJ.

Sommers, C. (2001). *The war against boys: How misguided feminism is harming our young men*. New York : Simon & Schuster.

Tom, A. (1996). External influences on teacher education programs: National accreditation and state certification. In K. Zeichner, S. Medrick, & M. Gomez (Eds.) *Currents of reform in pre-service teacher education,* pp. 11-29. New York: Teachers' College.

Townsend, B. (2000). The disproportionate discipline of African American learners: Reducing school suspensions and expulsions. *Exceptional Children, 66,* 381-391.

Young, Josephine & William Brozo. Boys Will be Boys, or Will They?: Literacy and Masculinities. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 36 (2001): 316-25.