

ANTISOCIAL AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR, SCHOOL VIOLENCE, AND DATING VIOLENCE IN ADOLESCENCE
CONDUCTA ANTISOCIAL Y DELICTIVA, VIOLENCIA ESCOLAR Y VIOLENCIA EN LAS RELACIONES DE PAREJA EN ADOLESCENTES
COMPORTAMENTO ANTI-SOCIAL E DELINQUENTE, VIOLÊNCIA ESCOLAR E VIOLÊNCIA DE PARCEIROS ÍNTIMOS EM ADOLESCENTES

Marta RUIZ-NAREZO*, Rosa SANTIBAÑEZ GRUBER*
& Teresa LAESPADA MARTÍNEZ
*University of Deusto

Received date: 22.VI.2021

Reviewed date: 30.VI.2021

Accepted date: 02.XI.2021

<p>KEY WORDS: adolescence; antisocial behaviour; school violence; dating violence; interactions among violent behaviours</p>	<p>ABSTRACT: This article is aimed at analyzing three forms of violent behaviour, in addition to what it is that triggers what is known as "interactions among violent behaviours"; that is, what feeds back into violent behaviours, whether it is the victim and/or the aggressor simultaneously. The study sample consisted of 433 adolescents aged 12-19 years from four educational centers: two from ESO and two from FPB from a municipality of Greater Bilbao. The results show differences based on gender, showing a greater involvement among boys, as well as differences according to the educational pathway, with a higher prevalence of FPB students conducting antisocial behaviour than ESO students in school violence forms of behaviour and with no significant differences observed regarding dating violence. Finally, there was evidence to suggest the existence of interactions among violent behaviours.</p>
<p>PALABRAS CLAVE: adolescencia; conducta antisocial; violencia escolar; violencia de pareja; interacciones entre las conductas violentas</p>	<p>RESUMEN: Este artículo tiene como objetivo analizar tres conductas violentas, además de analizar la activación de interacciones entre los comportamientos violentos; es decir, la retroalimentación entre conductas violentas, pudiendo ser víctima y/o agresor al mismo tiempo. Contaremos con una muestra de 433 adolescentes de entre 12 y 19 años de cuatro centros educativos; dos de ESO y dos de FPB de un municipio del Gran Bilbao. Los resultados, muestran diferencias en función del género, observándose una mayor implicación de los hombres, así como diferencias en función del itinerario educativo, mostrando una prevalencia superior del alumnado de FPB en la conducta antisocial, del alumnado de ESO en la conducta de violencia escolar y no observándose diferencias significativas en la violencia en parejas adolescentes. Finalmente, queda probada la existencia de interacciones entre los comportamientos violentos.</p>

CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORS

Marta Ruiz-Narezo. Faculty of Education and Sports. Avenida de las Universidades, 24. 48007, Bilbao, Bizkaia. E-mail: marta.ruiznarezo@deusto.es

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: adolescência; comportamento anti-social; violência escolar; violência do parceiro íntimo; interacções entre comportamentos violentos	RESUMO: O objectivo deste artigo é analisar três comportamentos violentos, bem como analisar a activação de interacções entre comportamentos violentos; ou seja, o feedback entre comportamentos violentos, podendo ser uma vítima e/ou agressor ao mesmo tempo. Tere-mos uma amostra de 433 adolescentes entre os 12 e 19 anos de quatro escolas; duas escolas secundárias e duas escolas de formação profissional num município da área da Grande Bil-bao. Os resultados mostram diferenças de acordo com o género, com um maior envolvimento dos homens, bem como diferenças de acordo com o percurso educativo, mostrando uma maior prevalência de estudantes em formação profissional em comportamento anti-social, maior prevalência de estudantes em ESO em violência escolar e nenhuma diferença signifi-cativa na violência em casais adolescentes. Finalmente, está provada a existência de interacções entre comportamentos violentos.
--	--

1. Introduction

Risk behaviours have always generated interest and social alarm, especially when they focus on the adolescent stage, as, often, this stage is depicted as a troublesome and rough time. This article is aimed at analyzing the incidence of three adolescent risk behaviours: antisocial behaviour, school violence, and dating violence during obligatory secondary education (ESO in Spanish) and basic vocational training (FPB in Spanish). Moreover, it describes the roles of the victim and the aggressor as well as the gender role within the scope of this phenomenon.

This research is part of a broader study, Bizkume¹, which has been developed continuously between 2012 and 2015, where interactions within the family and school environments and academic performance have been established from an ecological systems perspective aligned with the most recent approaches in the field (Espelage, 2014; Jiménez & Estévez, 2017) in relation to six adolescent risk behaviours.

According to Bundock, Chan, and Hewwit (2018) cited by WHO, (1986: 1), adolescence is understood as an important stage of development, and following the data provided by WHO (1986) recommends using a broad age range of 10 to 24 years, as the end of adolescence may depend on cultural views and different expectations of independence

Presently, risk behaviour is understood as behaviour that puts the health or well-being of oneself or others at risk. For example, violence (Ruiz-Narezo, González de Audikana, Fonseca, & Santibáñez, 2014) is a risk behaviour and an important social problem (Lai, Zeng, & Meng Chu, 2016). As Choi indicates (2017: 2), aggression is associated with various types of maladjustments, such as peer rejection (Choi, Parl, & Shin, 2016), delinquency, and substance abuse (Lynne-Landsman, Graber, Nichols, & Botvin, 2011).

The operational definition of violence in adolescence has evolved and adapted to different expressions. Thus, the term “antisocial behaviour” does not appear until 1971. It was understood to

be a behaviour that violated social norms and standards. Adolescents involved in antisocial behaviour are currently referred to as offenders.

Moreover, the term “school violence” has evolved since Olweus (1978) first described this behaviour. When referring specifically to bullying, the term was not incorporated until 2003 (APA, 2015), and it is understood to be a form of intimidation, mockery, threat, insult, victimization, or aggression. Authors have established various classifications and nuances (Díaz-Aguado, Martínez, & Martín, 2013, Garaigordobil, 2011, Vidales-Bolaños & Sádaba-Chalezquer, 2017, Basque Institute of Evaluation and Educational Research, 2017) and have agreed that aggression, damage intent, and repetitive character are its main characteristics.

On the other hand, dating violence, usually called dating violence, has limited research. In this context, the positions of both Díaz-Aguado and Carvajal (2011) and de Miguel Luken (2015) are of interest as they are particularly relevant on the exposure and perception of dating violence among adolescents.

To intervene on risk behaviours in general and on violent behaviour in particular, experts have focused on the explanation of the phenomenon, sometimes by analyzing influential individual variables such as stressful life events, exposure to violence, early and persistent behaviour problems, and lack of social ties, alienation, rebelliousness, and resistance to authority (Cerezo, 2009), among others.

Experts incorporate variables from the social, family, school, and community context. They refer, on the one hand, to the adolescent and his/her individual characteristics (Méndez & Cerezo, 2011) and, on the other hand, the environment, that is, the family, the educational center, the community, as well as the peer group. This phenomenon is well known for its complexity. Therefore, most recent studies on the different types of violence in adolescence (Save the Children, 2016, WHO, 2016, Musaleb & Castro, 2016) have been conducted following ecological-systemic approaches, overcoming the mere juxtaposition or addition of individual and social factors and incorporating interactions, based on the adolescent and the

surrounding environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; R. Jessor & Jessor, 1977), and maintaining an evolutionary and transitional vision of the phenomenon.

According to Espelage (2014), a key factor in understanding episodes of school violence is incorporating not only the “spatial” contexts but also what he refers to as the “chronosystem” into the ecological model. Although, in a strict sense, this would refer to vital events, it could be extended to any situation occurring throughout the life cycle. Finally, Sentse, Kretschmer, and Salmivalli (2015) and Jiménez and Estévez (2017) proposed the inclusion of not only the ecological systems perspective but also the gender perspective. The first team through its longitudinal research in Finland and the second in Mexico enable us to anticipate the phenomenon’s complexity, the interactions, the nuances, and the need to go further into these investigations.

Lewis and Fremouw (2001), in relation to adolescent dating violence, differentiated five dimensions, including sociodemographic, interpersonal, clinical, historical, and contextual factors, and referred to the importance and need to distinguish them from those factors related to intimate partner violence, both from the perspectives of the aggressor and victim.

Some studies have attempted to understand the profiles behind the aggressors and their victims, that is, how people deploy their personal traits in different interaction contexts. Moreover, the victims’ profile is usually coincident with a small group of friends and with a situation nearing school and social exclusion. It applies to lonely and, often, rejected people, with poor social skills and thus in a situation of helplessness and vulnerability (Ortega & Mora-Merchán, 2008). Although some of these investigations characterize students in fixed roles of aggressor or victim, others allude to the possibility of a role change (Cuadrado & Fernández, 2009; Ortega & Mora-Merchán, 2008). Thus, in the study by Ortega and Mora-Merchán (2008), the role of “aggressive victim” appears as a mixed typology. If, for example, a person suffers an aggression, he or she can respond to it or, in another context, can change his or her role and initiate a new aggression. Similarly, Cuadrado and Fernández (2009) refer to two types of victims: aggressive victims and passive or submissive victims. The aggressive victims include those who change roles, and studies on their incidence are highly inconsistent, with large variations concerning the results and with a prevalence ranging from 0.4% to 28.6%, which, according to the authors, is due to methodological reasons, the instruments used, and the sociocultural origin of the study population.

Espelage & Holt (2007) with a sample of 684 students of middle and high school showed that bully-victims were at risk for other victimization such as dating violence or peer sexual harassment. In addition, Cudmore, Cuevas & Sabina (2017) open a new and promising research line, carrying out a study associating polyvictimisation with self-reported delinquency with a sample of 1.525 adolescents. They found partial support to that hypothesis. They supported their hypothesis on the basis that if people are victim of different offenses, people are likely to develop a negative feeling and to react coherently in that direction.

In this regard, the gender differences also remain unclear (Álvarez-García, Barreiro-Collazo, & Núñez, 2017; Santibáñez, Ruiz-Narezo, González de Audikana, & Fonseca, 2016; Ruiz-Narezo et al., 2014; Díaz-Aguado et al., 2013; Povedano, Jiménez, Amador, Moreno, & Musitu, 2012). In their review, Cuadrado & Fernández (2009) state that there are few studies on this subject and they are neither decisive nor conclusive. Those who find different results do so with a slight difference, with men appearing as more aggressive compared with women (Álvarez-García et al., 2017). Boys see themselves as more aggressive and more victimized in those studies where they are asked about both roles (Díaz-Aguado et al., 2013; Ruiz-Narezo et al., 2014). In this part of the investigation, Cuadrado & Fernández (2009) find differences based on gender, both in the type of response issued and, in the intensity, thereof. Boys are more prone to both direct and indirect physical aggression as well as to verbal aggression, while women, for their part, do so by propagating false rumors or speaking evil of other girls. Povedano et al. (2012) also found differences and nuances in terms of gender in physical and verbal victimization; however, they conclude by stating that the structural model is the same, which suggests that the victimization process is similar for both genders.

In view of this scenario, it is necessary to perform a more in-depth study on the appearance of interactions among violent behaviours to show a clear influence from the ecological systems perspective (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) and the important influence of social learning theory (Bandura & Walters, 1963; Bandura, 1977) both theories are of reference in this research, helping to contextualize and frame the situation, the former including the importance of the environment and the context in which the adolescent is situated, and the latter, the weight of observed social learning in the development and involvement in violent behaviour. The assumption and reproduction of

violent roles and behaviours is likely to occur in adolescence, by either experience or observation. Therefore, it is relevant and pertinent to conduct empirical studies that address these variables in a

joint manner and that help in the understanding of the phenomenon and the keys to its prevention.

Within this approach, the objectives and methodology are as follows.

OBJECTIVES	HYPOTHESIS
Objective 1: To analyse antisocial behaviour, school violence, and dating violence according to the educational pathway.	Hypothesis 1: There is a higher incidence among FPB students in antisocial behaviour, school violence, and dating violence.
Objective 2: To analyse antisocial behaviour, school violence, and partner violence based on gender.	Hypothesis 2: There are significant gender differences in the incidence of violent behaviour, with a higher incidence among boys than girls.
Objective 3: To explore the triggers of violence interactions among violent behaviours	Hypothesis 3: People who are victims of violent behaviour are more likely to acquire the role of aggressors.

Methodology²

Design

This research project has a non-experimental and transversal research approach, using quantitative methodology. The instrument used is an anonymous and self-registration questionnaire, applied to a sample of 433 people (i.e., 199 girls and 213 boys; 21 did not comply) in ESO (i.e., high school) and FPB (i.e., basic vocational training), aged 12-19 years, in four educational centers in a municipality of Greater Bilbao. This research had the participation of the public education centers of the municipalities chosen, and considered all the students who were in the aforementioned ages. It is interesting to be able to include in the research not only standard secondary school students (ESO), but also second chance school students (FPB).

Variables and Instrument

The questionnaire consists of 288 items organized into 40 questions related to school, family, and adolescent risk behaviour variables. Questions related to antisocial behaviour, school, and dating violence have been selected. These last two variables are analyzed from a dual role perspective: victims and aggressors. This dual role introduces four scenarios of school violence behaviour and six for dating violence, which are listed in increasing order, from insults, online aggression, up to physical aggression.

The questions have been derived from the *Drugs and School* studies developed since 1981 by *Instituto Deusto de Drogodependencias* (Deusto Institute of Drug Dependency; 2014) and other research (Díaz-Aguado & Carvajal, 2011; Olweus, 2007).

Adolescent Risk Behaviours	Authorship	Cronbach's Alpha
Antisocial (12 items) evaluates antisocial behaviour from offenses to crimes.	Instituto Deusto Drogodependencias [IDD] (2014)	.770
School Violence; Bullying (4 items): it evaluates verbal violence, physical violence on objects, on individuals; and online violence or through cell phones.	Instituto Deusto Drogodependencias [IDD] (2014) based on Olweus (1998; 2007)	Victim role students violence:.797
		Aggressor role students violence:.800
Dating violence (6 items). Evaluates verbal, physical, and sexual partner violence.	Díaz-Aguado and Carvajal (2011)	Victim role violence:.763
		Aggressor role violence:.780

The reliability test of the scales shows that all of Cronbach's Alpha coefficients obtained were adequate, being higher than .763 (Table 2).

Analysis and Results

A previous analysis on sample normality through the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test shows that data does not follow a normal distribution in any of the analyzed scales, showing a bilateral asymptotic significance of 0 in all of them. Therefore, the tests performed in this study were non-parametric. The previous analysis is actually a result in itself because it highlights the high percentage of adolescents that claim not to participate in violent behaviour. Although non-parametric tests are carried out, it is considered of interest to examine the relationship between the variables by means of regression analysis. To this end, a prior logarithmic transformation has been carried out to adjust the data to the assumptions of the linear regression model (Bland & Altman, 1996). All statistical analyses have been conducted using the SPSS program, version 23.

Following the first two objectives and hypotheses, the main incidence data based on educational pathway and gender are presented below.

The one-way analysis of variance shows significant differences in antisocial behaviour in both FPB and ESO students, with a higher incidence among male students in both cases (.006 in FPB and .001 in ESO). Furthermore, among ESO students, there are differences in behaviour relating to the school bullying practiced (.001), with a higher incidence of male versus female students. Similarly, it is relevant to allude to the non-existence of significant differences in the involvement of boys and girls from both educational pathways regarding the school bullying experienced (being a victim) as well as the involvement in adolescent dating violence, both from the victim and aggressor perspectives.

Data from the Mann-Whitney U test, based on gender and educational pathway, is presented below. Table 3 shows a greater involvement of boys from both educational pathways in antisocial behaviour, as well as a greater involvement of ESO boys carrying out school violence behaviour. Moreover, significant differences were observed in extremely few of the analyzed variables related to adolescent dating violence.

Table 3. Mann-Whitney U Test Based on Gender and Educational Pathway in Violent Behaviours Analyzed

	FPB BOYS				ESO BOYS				FPB GIRLS				ESO GIRLS
	n	Ranges	U	P	n	Ranges	U	P	n	Ranges	U	P	-
ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR													
Selling marijuana	57	48,64	761,500	.050	157	172,21	11428,500	.000					
Smoking joints in the street					159	173,28	11403,500	.002					
Causing commotion in the street					159	177,47	10896,500	.000					
Stealing from a car	57	48,50	826,500	.039	158	169,36	12030,000	.001					
Stealing in markets and warehouses	57	49,11	792,000	.017	159	169,89	12101,000	.001					
Using threats for personal gain	58	49,77	796,500	.049	159	169,60	12148,000	.008					
Shoplifting	57	50,84	693,000	.004	159	169,97	11930,500	.002					
Use of knives	57	49,88	748,000	.003	159	168,90	12259,500	.006					

	FPB BOYS				ESO BOYS				FPB GIRLS				ESO GIRLS
	n	Ranges	U	P	n	Ranges	U	P	n	Ranges	U	P	-
Driving under the influence of alcohol	57	48,68	816,000	.033	159	168,82	12271,500	.003					
SCHOOL VIOLENCE													
I have been hit or bumped, kicked, or locked up somewhere to intimidate me.					158	164,37	11080,000	.004					
I have stolen from, broken, or damaged things of a partner.					160	171,44	12010,000	.001					
I have hit or bumped, kicked, or locked a friend somewhere to intimidate him/her.					160	170,82	11949,000	.002					
DATING VIOLENCE													
He/she has hit me.					91	104,77	4753,000	.044					
I have publicly offended, insulted, or threatened people on social networks or harassed them through the cell phone.					91	105,23	4620,000	.003					
I have forced him/her to perform sexual acts that he/she did not want to do.					92	105,93	4652,000	.012					
I have hit him/her.									33	47,02	725,500	.032	

To respond to the third objective set regarding the triggers for violence interactions among violent behaviours, the Spearman's rho is performed to observe the existing correlations between the violent behaviours analyzed. In the following tables, significant correlations can be observed³ in the violent behaviours analyzed in terms of gender and educational pathway.

There are only correlations between antisocial behaviour and bullying at school experienced among FPB female students, with it being necessary to indicate that this data has a significance level of .05. Likewise, antisocial behaviour correlates

with school bullying in FPB boys and ESO students of both genders, showing a significance level lower than .01 in FPB boys and ESO girls and a significance level lower than .001 in ESO male students. Moreover, antisocial behaviour shows correlations with the abuse practiced among adolescent couples in both genders and educational pathways. Correlations are observed between the aggressions committed in the three violent behaviours analyzed. It is worthwhile to mention the existence of a correlation between the involvement of ESO female students in antisocial behaviour and victimization in couple's relationships.

Table 4. Correlations Observed in Spearman's Rho on Antisocial Behaviour

		BOYS		GIRLS	
<i>Observed correlation</i>		FPB	ESO	FPB ⁴	ESO
ANTISOCIAL	Bullying experienced	-	-	.795* Nn= 30	-
	Bullying practiced	.414** n = 53	.385*** n = 153		.177* n = 163
	Dating violence experienced	-	-	-	.266** n = 109
	Dating violence practiced	.359* n = 47	.234* n = 84	.431* n=31	.296** n = 109

School violence behaviour is analyzed from its dual role perspective, as shown in table 5. Regarding victimization, correlations with antisocial behaviour are observed among the FPB girls with a significance level of .05. Furthermore, correlations are observed in relation to school violence practiced by FPB boys (< .01) and ESO students, showing significant differences (i.e., lower than .001), and considering the aggressors and victims roles of the same behaviour. Similarly, there are correlations among FPB students (< .01) and ESO male students (< .001) with them suffering abuse from their partner and them being victims of two forms of violent behaviours. Abuse practiced in partner relationships shows correlations with the bullying experienced among ESO boys (< .001) and FPB girls, with them recognizing themselves as victims within the school context and as aggressors in the adolescent partner relationship.

Continuing with school violence, in reference to the role of aggressor, correlations are observed between the involvement in antisocial behaviour of ESO students—with lower prominence (.001) among boys—and FPB boys. Correlations are also shown in school violence victimization among ESO students, showing a lower significance level in both boys and girls (.001), and FPB boys. There are also correlations with dating violence, maintaining victim roles in at least two violent behaviours in both educational pathways analyzed—both among boys and girls—with the most extreme significant differences, lower than .0001 among FPB girls. Concluding with a reference to the existing correlation between bullying and dating violence practiced among ESO students and FPB girls. Especially relevant is the data on the observed correlations between the school violence practiced and the violence practiced within the partner relationship context, showing < .001 in both ESO boys and FPB girls.

Table 5. Correlations Observed in the Spearman's Rho in School Violence Behaviour; Victim Role and Aggressor Role

		BOYS		GIRLS	
<i>Observed correlation</i>		FPB	ESO	FPB ⁵	ESO
BULLYING EXPERIENCED	Antisocial behaviour	-	-	.795 n = 30*	-
	Bullying practiced	.378** n = 53	.475*** n = 154	-	.488*** n = 151
	Dating violence experienced	.429** n = 48	.346*** n = 86	.367* n = 30	-
	Dating violence practiced	-	.467*** n = 87	.415* n = 30	-
BULLYING PRACTICED	Antisocial behaviour	.414** n = 53	.385*** n = 153	-	.177* n = 163
	Bullying experienced	.378** n = 53	.475*** n = 154	-	.488*** n = 151
	Dating violence experienced	.407** n = 51	.284** n = 89	.620*** n = 33	.214* n = 109
	Dating violence practiced	-	.382*** n = 89	.619*** n = 33	.299** n = 109

[*P </= .05; ** P </= .01; ***P </= .001].

Regarding the victim role, correlations with anti-social behaviour are observed among ESO girls, as well as involvement in school violence behaviours from the perspective of the victim among ESO students—observing $< .001$ among the ESO students—and FPB boys. Moreover, the violence suffered within the partner relationship context shows correlations among both boys and girls of both educational pathways with the involvement in violent behaviours practiced both in the school environment, showing $< .001$ in ESO boys and FPB girls, and within the partner relationship itself, showing significance indexes equal to or lower than $.001$ in both girls and boys from both educational pathways.

Lastly, reference must be made to the role of the aggressor in adolescent partner relationships.

This variable shows correlations with involvement in antisocial behaviour and in violent behaviours experienced within the partner relationship context among both boys and girls from both educational pathways ($< .001$), besides correlations with bullying experienced by ESO boys ($< .001$) and FPB girls and correlations with the bullying practiced by ESO students, showing boys $< .001$, and FPB girls ($< .001$). Especially relevant are the correlations observed between violence practiced and experienced among both genders and educational pathways, with significant correlations lower than or equal to $.001$ being observed.

Dating violence, analyzed from the victim and aggressor roles and as shown in Table 6, shows the following correlations.

Table 6. Correlations Observed in Spearman’s Rho in Adolescent Dating Violence; Victim Role and Aggressor Role

		BOYS		GIRLS	
		FPB	ESO	FPB ^a	ESO
		Observed correlation			
DATING VIOLENCE VICTIM	Antisocial behaviour	-	-	-	.266** n = 109
	Bullying experienced	.429** n = 48	.346*** n = 86	.367* n = 30	-
	Bullying practiced	.407** n = 51	.284*** n = 89	.620*** n = 33	.214* n = 109
	Dating violence practiced	.636*** n = 52	.660*** n = 89	.788*** n = 33	.650*** n = 109
DATING VIOLENCE AGGRESSOR	Antisocial behaviour	.359* n = 47	.234* n = 84	.431* n = 31	.296** n = 109
	Bullying experienced	-	.467*** n = 87	.415* n = 30	-
	Bullying practiced	-	.382*** n = 89	.619*** n = 33	.299** n = 109
	Dating violence experienced	.636*** n = 52	.660*** n = 89	.788*** n = 33	.650*** n = 109

[*P $</=$.05; ** P $</=$.01; ***P $</=$.001].

As indicated above, multiple interactions among violence risk behaviours and the roles of aggressor and victim are detected. It is clear, therefore, that mainly among ESO students (both boys and girls), there is a link in the reproduction and victimization of antisocial behaviour, school violence, and dating violence acts, with them becoming, in many cases, aggressors and victims simultaneously. To delve deeper into this information, a linear regression analysis was performed. This one used the multiple regression model by successive steps. This analysis was conducted on a gender basis, and a_H and a_M was added to the men and women predictive models, respectively.

Regarding the *antisocial behaviour* variable (CA, by its Spanish acronym) in boys, the following predictive model that explains 45.4% of the

variance was obtained. In the model, the dependent variable, antisocial behaviour, is explained by the bullying practiced (2.488), the abuse carried out in partner relationships (.848), and the bullying experienced (-1.490) so that the greater the bullying practiced, the greater the abuse practiced in partner relationships, and the lower the bullying experienced, the greater the antisocial behaviour, with a constant of 3.019.

$$CA_H = 2.488.BE + 1.490.BR + .848.MPE + 3.019$$

In the equation with the Beta coefficients categorized, we indicate that the bullying practiced has the highest predictive capacity with (Beta = 0.647)

$$Z_{CAH} = 0.647.ZBE - 0.320.ZBR + 0.241.ZMPE$$

We can see that in the case of girls, CA is explained in 26.3% of the variance by the variable adolescent dating violence practiced (1.013), obtaining a more parsimonious simple regression model.

$$CA_M = 1.013.MPE + 1.493$$

With respect to the variable *school violence experienced-victim role-(BR)* in boys, we obtain the following predictive model that explains 41.8% of the variance. In the prediction model obtained, the dependent variable of school violence experienced is explained by the dating violence practiced (.375), antisocial behaviour (.073) and bullying (.341) so that the greater the bullying experienced, the greater the involvement in the dating violence practiced and in school violence itself, and a lower involvement in antisocial behaviour, with a constant .405.

$$BR_H = 0.375.MPE \cdot 0.073.CA + 0.341.BE + .405.$$

The equation with the typified Beta coefficients states that the greatest predictive weight is that of the dating violence practiced, with Beta = 0.497.

$$ZBR_H = 0.497.ZMPE \cdot 0.342.ZCA + 0.413.ZBE$$

We can appreciate that in the case of girls, the school violence experienced (i.e., *BR*) behaviour is explained in 43.2% by the variable bullying practiced (.957) obtaining a more parsimonious simple regression model.

$$BR_M = 0.957.BE + 0.271$$

Regarding the variable *school violence practiced-aggressor role-(BE)* in boys, we obtain a predictive model that explains 51.1% of the variance. In this prediction model, the dependent variable-violent school behaviour practiced-is explained by antisocial behaviour (0.153) and bullying experienced (0.439), so that the greater the bullying practiced, the greater the involvement in antisocial behaviour and bullying behaviours from the role of victim with a constant of -0.072.

$$BE_H = 0.153.CA + 0.439.BR - 0.072.$$

In the equation with the Beta coefficients typified, the greatest predictive weight is that of antisocial behaviour, with Beta = 0.588.

$$ZBE_H = 0.588.ZCA - 0.363.ZBR$$

In the case of girls, the school violence practiced (*BE*) is explained in 47.9% by a predictive model comprising the same behaviours as those among boys. That is, the dependent variable-violent school behaviour practiced-is explained by antisocial behaviour (0.073) and the bullying experienced (0.436), so that the greater the bullying

practiced, the greater the involvement in antisocial behaviours and bullying behaviours from the role of victim with a constant of .028.

$$BE_M = 0.073.CA + 0.436.BR \cdot 0.028.$$

In the equation with the typified Beta coefficients, we observe that the greatest predictive weight is that of the bullying experienced, with Beta = 0.634.

$$ZBE_M = 0.217.ZCA \cdot 0.634.ZBR$$

Concerning the variable *dating violence experienced in adolescence-victim role-(MPR)* in boys, we have the following predictive model that explains 46.1% of the variance. In the predictive model obtained, the dependent variable-dating violence experienced-is explained by the dating violence practiced (0.699) with a constant 0.440.

$$MPR_H = 0.699.MPE + 0.440.$$

In the case of girls, the dating violence experienced (*MPR*) is explained in 57.7% of the variance by the variable dating violence practiced (.898) obtaining a more simple parsimonious regression model.

$$MPR_M = 0.898.MPE + 0.346$$

Finally, it is noteworthy that for the variable *dating violence practiced during adolescence-aggressor role-(MPE)* in boys, we obtain the following predictive model that explains 55.6% of the variance. In the prediction model obtained, the dependent variable, dating violence practiced, is explained by the violent behaviour experienced (0.446) and the school violence experienced (0.528), so that the greater the dating violence practiced, the greater the victimization, both within the school environment and within the context of the partner relationship, with a constant -0.100.

$$MPE_H = 0.528.MPR + 0.446.BR \cdot 0.100.$$

In the equation with the typified Beta coefficients, it can be observed that the greatest predictive weight is that of the dating violence experienced, with Beta = 0.544.

$$ZMPE_H = 0.544.ZMPR + 0.337.ZBR$$

We can observe that in the case of girls, the dating violence practiced is explained in 60.9% by a predictive model that comprises the variables antisocial behaviour (0.102) and dating violence experienced (0.563) with a constant of -0.143.

$$MPE_M = 0.563.MPR + 0.102.CA - 0.143$$

In the equation with the Beta coefficients typified, the greatest predictive weight is that of the dating violence experienced, with Beta = 0.666.

$$ZMPE_M = 0.666.ZMPR + 0.202.ZCA$$

We conclude, therefore, that there are violence interactions among violent behaviours or feedback practices between the three behaviours analyzed and the victim-aggressor roles within their context.

Discussion

We can affirm, both in relation to the first and second objectives, that there are differences depending on the educational pathway and gender in the three violent behaviours analyzed; antisocial behaviour, bullying, and dating violence. In ESO, boys show greater involvement in the three violent behaviours. These results were similar to those obtained by Cuadrado and Fernández (2009) on a sample of 2000 ESO students in Extremadura, who also concluded that boys were more prone to physical and verbal aggression. It was stated that there were few studies and that they were inconclusive. In FPB, however, there are no significant differences between boys and girls regarding bullying or in dating violence. This last data should be interpreted with some caution, given that samples of girls in this pathway are very small. This data was also recognized by Povedano et al. (2012).

In sum, in this study, boys are more involved in violent behaviours within both educational pathways, in antisocial behaviours, except for behaviours regarded as more “standardized” and socially accepted such as “*hacer botellón*” (adolescents drinking in the street), data coinciding with what was stated by the *Instituto Nacional de Estadística* (National Institute of Statistics; 2018).

Likewise, there is a greater involvement of boys in school violence behaviours—both practiced and experienced—in both educational pathways. We agree with the results by Díaz-Aguado et al. (2013), where boys identified themselves in greater proportion than women as aggressors and victims, that is, in both roles, in situations of school violence, although it is true that some studies have not shown big gender differences such as Álvarez-García et al. (2017). It seems necessary to continue refining methodological aspects to find results that are more consistent.

On the contrary, and being relevant data, adolescent dating violence does not show significant gender-based differences in FPB. This fact indicates that adolescent dating violence is integrated and accepted by both boys and girls. This gives rise to what might be called “*couples in conflict*” and observing “*reciprocal violence interactions*,” where the same individuals play a role of victim and aggressor simultaneously. Some experts

explain these behaviours by sexist attitudes and perceptions, which have been explained in previous studies (Díaz-Aguado & Carvajal, 2011; de Miguel Luken, 2015). According to Díaz-Aguado and Carvajal (2011), 35% of adolescent boys did not consider “controlling everything my partner does” to be a violent behaviour. Rodríguez (2015) showed an analysis of violent behaviours from the dual role-victim and aggressor—in which there was evidence of a social change, where both boys and girls recognized themselves in both roles, data coinciding with that obtained in the empirical framework of this research.

The third objective explores the existence and triggers of violent interactions among violent behaviours. Interactions between risk behaviours and role changes are confirmed. (i.e., victim-aggressor, aggressor-victim), as mentioned by Díaz-Aguado and Carvajal, (2011), Bender and Lösel (2011), and Díaz-Aguado et al. (2013). Other authors used the term “cycle of violence” (Choi, 2017) in relation to the term derived from aggression among students and the use of corporal punishment by teachers, as well as the relationship observed between child abuse and involvement in violence and future victimization (Manchikanti, 2011). This study has been developed with a holistic and complex approach because it not only analyzes one violent behaviour, as has been done so far, but also incorporates an analysis from the dual role of victim and aggressor and seeks interactions with other violent behaviours.

Being involved in violent behaviours, as a victim or as an aggressor, would increase the likelihood of such behaviour being reproduced in the opposite role, or reciprocally, in other contexts and with other people. This violence interactions among violent behaviours would occur when the same person is involved in one or several situations of violence simultaneously, either as an aggressor or as a victim in this or other violent behaviours. We are speaking of the cycle of violence when alluding to the reciprocal interactions among violent behaviours and not to a linear relationship between behaviours. That is, it would not be possible to state which “behaviour 1” predicts “behaviour 2,” but instead, we refer to the multiple and complex interactions occurring between the different behaviours. For this reason, we consider that although the analysis on the existence of violent cycles would be of great interest, in this research we can only talk about the observed interactions.

Classic authors can help us understand it. As explained by Bandura (1977), as part of his theory of social learning, the reciprocal determinism, stating that the environment interacts and influences

people and vice versa, referring to the complexity of interactions between own behaviours and the behaviours resulting from the environment, as well as alluding to the reproduction of external stimuli, both positive and negative. According to our analysis, individuals identifying themselves as victims, occasionally, commit aggressions targeted to the same people who attacked them or other people to escape from their frustration. Chauv (2003) also reaffirms this idea, emphasizing that the violence experienced in the context of minors reinforces the need to practice violence; this idea once again suggests our hypothesis of the existence of violence interactions among violent behaviours.

The empirical analysis of this study has shown a new approach to risk behaviour in adolescence that will also require a holistic approach within the socio-educational intervention context owing to its high complexity. This intervention will focus not only on improving the quality of life of each adolescent but also on reinforcing educational support based on the empowerment of the person, which gradually favors the promotion of protection factors and the reducing the existing risk factors.

The importance of the analysis should also be considered as it indicates a similar prevalence among FPB boys and girls—although, as indicated by Ortega and Mora-Merchán (2008), caution is advised since the sample of girls is usually smaller—and a slightly higher prevalence of ESO boys. This data is in line with the results obtained by Álvarez-García et al. (2017). That is, the influence of the family and school environments (Ortega-Barón, Buelga, & Cava, 2016) and school performance in the development of violent behaviours, from victimization or aggression, as well as the existing interaction with other violent behaviours, and understanding the need to make global interventions that consider not only all the systems involved but also the participating variables.

Finally, there is evidence to suggest the need to delve into studies with larger samples, which emphasizes the importance of incorporating different behaviours in their different roles, considering the individual variables and those of different contexts (i.e., family, school, peer, social) including a temporal perspective, as it has been done in the latest studies on the matter (Ortega & Mora-Merchán, 2008; Espelage, 2014; Jiménez & Estévez, 2015; Sentse et al., 2015).

Notas

- ¹ Bizkume. Umearren etorkizuna eraikitzen. Minors and adolescents in a severe unprotected situation.
- ² In relation to the procedure, this study has been developed respecting current regulations and principles of ethics related to the protection and avoidance of risks to participants and respect for autonomy.
- ³ [*P </= .05; ** P </= .01; ***P </= .001].
- ⁴ The sample size of FPB girls is not large enough to show whether there are correlations, for example: life consumption, abuse experienced from teachers, self-esteem, etc.
- ⁵ The sample size of FPB girls is not large enough to know whether there are correlations, for example: life consumption, abuse experienced from teachers, self-esteem, etc.
- ⁶ The sample size of FPB girls is not large enough to know whether there are correlations, for example: life consumption, abuse experienced from teachers, self-esteem, etc.

References

- Álvarez-García, D., Barreiro-Collazo, A., & Núñez, J. (2017). Cyber aggression among adolescents: Prevalence and gender differences. *Comunicar*, 25(50), 89-97. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C50-2017-08>
- American Psychological Association. (5 de mayo de 2015). PsycINFO. Thesaurus (subjects). Retrieved from <https://googl/WPhWoc>. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e384842004-026>
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. (1963). *Social learning and personality development*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bender, D., & Lösel, F. (2011). Bullying at school as a predictor of delinquency, violence and other anti-social behaviour in adulthood. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 21(2), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.799>
- Bland, J.M. & Altman, D.G. (1996). Statistics Notes: Transforming data. *BMJ*, 312: 770. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.312.7033.770>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Bundock, K., Chan, C., & Hewitt, O. (2018). Adolescents' help-seeking behaviour and intentions following adolescent dating violence: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018770412>
- Cerezo, F. (2009). *La violencia en las aulas. Análisis y propuestas de intervención*. Madrid: Pirámide.
- Chaux, E. (2003). Agresión reactiva, agresión instrumental y ciclo de violencia. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 15, 47-58.
- Choi, B. (2017). Cycle of violence in schools: Longitudinal reciprocal relationship between student 's aggression ant teacher's use of corporal punishments. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517741627>.
- Cuadrado, I., & Fernández, I. (2009). Funcionalidad y niveles de integración de las TIC para facilitar el aprendizaje escolar de carácter constructivista. *Revista Iberoamericana de Informática Educativa*, 9, 22-34.
- Cudmore, R.M., Cuevas, C.A. & Sabina, Ch. (2017). The impact of polyvictimization on delinquency among latino adolescents: A General Strain Theory perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(17), 2647-2667.
- Díaz-Aguado, M., Martínez, R., & Martín, J. (2013). Bullying among adolescents in Spain. Prevalence, participants' roles and characteristics attributable to victimization by victims and aggressors. *Revista de Educación*, 362, 348-379. <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2011-362-164>
- Díaz-Aguado, M., & Carvajal, M. (2011). *Equality and the prevention of gender-based violence in adolescence*. Madrid: Publicaciones Ministerio de Sanidad, Política Social e Igualdad.
- ERIC (The Education Resources Information Center). (15 de abril de 2015). *Thesaurus*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/>
- Espelage, D.L. & Holt, M.K. (2007). Dating violence & sexual harassment across the bully-victim continuum among middle and high school students. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 36: 799-811.
- Espelage, D. (2014). Ecological theory: Preventing youth bullying, aggression, and victimization. *Theory Into Practice*, 53(4), 257-264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.947216>
- Estévez, E., & Jiménez, T. (2015). Aggressive behaviour and personal and school adjustment in a sample of Spanish adolescent students. *Universithas Psychologica*, 14, 111-123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1144/Javeriana.upsy14-1.caap>
- Garaigordobil, M. (2011). Prevalence and consequences of cyberbullying: A review. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 11 (2), 233-254.
- Instituto Deusto Drogodependencias. (2014). *Las drogas entre los escolares de Euskadi veinticinco años después*. Bilbao: Publicaciones Deusto.
- Miguel Luken, V. de (2015). *Perception of gender-based violence among adolescents and young adults*. Madrid: Government Delegation for Gender-Based Violence (MSSSI) publications.
- National Institute of Statistics. (September 29, 2018). *Menores condenados según sexo, edad y nacionalidad 2016* [Data file]. Retrieved from <http://www.ine.es/jaxiT3/Datos.htm?t=25721>
- Basque Institute of Evaluation and Educational Research. (2017). *Maltrato entre iguales 2016*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: ISEI-IVEI.
- Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. (1977). *Problem behaviour and psychosocial development: A longitudinal study of youth*. New York: Academic Press.
- Jimenez, T., & Estevez, E. (2017). School aggression in adolescence: Examining the role of individual, family and school variables. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 17, 251-260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2017.07.002>
- Lai, V., Zeng, G., & Meng Chu, C. (2016). Violent and nonviolent youth offenders: Preliminary evidence on group subtypes. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 14(3), 313-319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204015615193>
- Lewis, S. F., & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21, 105-127. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358\(99\)00042-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(99)00042-2)
- Manchikanti, A. (2011). Testing the cycle of violence hypothesis: Child abuse and adolescent dating violence as predictors of partner violence in young adulthood. *Youth & Society*, 43, 171-192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X09358313>.
- Méndez, I., & Cerezo, F. (2011). Bullying y variables interpersonales en la adolescencia relacionadas con el riesgo para el consumo de drogas. *International Journal of Developmental and Educational Psychology*, 2(1), 89-97.
- Musaleb, B., & Castro, O. (2016). Qué se sabe del bullying. *Revista de Medicina Clínica Las Condes*, 26(1), 14-23.
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools. Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington DC: Hemisphere Press.
- Olweus, D. (2007). *Olweus Bullying Questionnaire*. Center City, MN: Hazelden Publishing.
- World Health Organization. (2016). *Growing up unequal. HBSC 2016 study (2013/2014 survey)*. WHO.
- Ortega, R., & Mora-Merchán, J. A. (2008). Peer networks and the bullying phenomenon: Exploring the control-submission schema. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 31, 515-528
- Ortega-Barón, J., Buelga, S., & Cava, M. (2016). The influence of school climate and family climate among adolescents' victims of cyberbullying. *Comunicar*, 46, 57-65. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C46-2016-06>
- Povedano, A., Jiménez, I., Moreno, D., Amador, I. V., & Musitu, G. (2012). The relationship between family conflict and expressivity with school victimisation: The role of self-esteem, depressive symptomatology and gender in adolescents. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 35, 421-43

- Rodríguez, S. (2015). Dating violence: Preliminary study of prevalence and justification. *Pedagogía social: Revista interuniversitaria*, 25, 251-275.
- Ruiz-Narezo, M., González de Audikana, M., Fonseca, I., & Santibáñez, R. (2014). Conductas de riesgo en adolescentes. Diferencias entre chicos y chicas. En *Actas de Congreso Internacional Infancia en contextos de riesgo* (pp. 2733-2744). Huelva: FUNIBER.
- Santibáñez, R., Ruiz-Narezo, M., González de Audikana, J., & Fonseca, J. (2016). Adolescent couples in conflict: Exploring the incidence of violence in early emotional relationships *Educació Social: Revista d'Intervenció Socioeducativa*, 63, 79-94.
- Save the Children. (2016). *Yo a eso no juego. Bullying y ciberbullying en la infancia*. Madrid: Save the children y AECID.
- Sentse, M., Kretschmer, T., & Salmivalli, C. (2015). The longitudinal interplay between bullying, victimization, and social status: age-related and gender differences. *Social Development*, 24(3), 659-677. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12115>
- Vidales-Bolaños, M., & Sádaba-Chalezquer, C. (2017). Connected teens: Measuring the Impact of Mobile Phones on Social Relationships through Social Capital. *Comunicar*, 53, 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C53-2017-02>

HOW TO CITE THE ARTICLE

Ruiz-Narezo, M., Santibáñez, R., & Laespada, T. (2021) Antisocial and Criminal Behaviour, School Violence, and Dating Violence in Adolescence. *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 39, 139-152. DOI: 10.7179/PSRI_2021.39.09

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

MARTA RUIZ-NAREZO. E-mail: marta.ruiznarezo@deusto.es

ROSA SANTIBÁÑEZ GRUBER. E-mail: rosa.santibanez@deusto.es

TERESA LAESPADA MARTÍNEZ. E-mail: laespada@deusto.es

PERFIL ACADÉMICO

MARTA RUIZ-NAREZO. Professor of the Department of Social Pedagogy and Diversity at the University of Deusto. Graduated in Social Education, Master in Drug Addiction and Other Addictions and PhD in Educational Innovation and Lifelong Learning from the University of Deusto. Member of the INTERVENTION team: Quality of Life and Social Inclusion, a team recognized by the Basque Government (IT1118-16). His field of research focuses on adolescence and risk behaviours in this life stage.

ROSA SANTIBAÑEZ GRUBER. Doctor in Pedagogy from the University of Deusto and a diploma in Criminology from the University of the Basque Country. Professor of Social Pedagogy and Diversity at the University of Deusto since 2010 and main researcher of the INTERVENTION team: Quality of Life and Social Inclusion, a team recognized by the Basque Government (IT1118-16). Her research lines and publications are mainly focused on disadvantaged groups and social exclusion, as well as on the development of educational intervention strategies for social inclusion. She is currently vice-rector for Research and Transfer at the University of Deusto.

TERESA LAESPADA MARTÍNEZ. Doctor in Sociology from the University of Deusto. Degree in Political Science and Sociology. Professor at the University of Deusto in the Faculty of Psychology and Education. She has been director of the Deusto Institute of Drug Addiction, director of the Master's Degree in Drug Addiction and Other Addictions, and member of various scientific committees of scientific journals. She is currently the provincial deputy for Employment, Social Insertion and Equality of the Provincial Council of Bizkaia.