

## VIOLENCE AND SCHOOL COEXISTENCE IN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS OF CERCADO DE LIMA, PERU

*Dennys Picho-Durand<sup>1\*</sup>, John Morillo-Flores<sup>2</sup>, Yolanda Soria-Pérez<sup>3</sup>, Nikita Shardin-Flores<sup>4</sup>, Alejandro Menacho-Rivera<sup>5</sup>, Jesús Huachallanqui-Salcedo<sup>6</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>Universidad Privada san Juan Bautista, Perú, [history.dennys.37@gmail.com](mailto:history.dennys.37@gmail.com), <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4799-1521>

<sup>2</sup>Universidad Privada san Juan Bautista, Perú, [john.morillo@upsjb.edu.pe](mailto:john.morillo@upsjb.edu.pe), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2136-4458>

<sup>3</sup>Universidad César Vallejo, Perú, [ysoria@ucv.edu.pe](mailto:ysoria@ucv.edu.pe), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1171-4768>

<sup>4</sup>Universidad Señor de Sipan, Perú, [sfloresnikita@crece.uss.edu.pe](mailto:sfloresnikita@crece.uss.edu.pe), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5527-5517>

<sup>5</sup>Universidad César Vallejo, Perú, [alejandrol31071@gmail.com](mailto:alejandrol31071@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9608-6342>

<sup>6</sup>Universidad Nacional del Callao, Perú, [jhuachallanqui@gmail.com](mailto:jhuachallanqui@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2874-969X>

**Dennys Picho-Durand, John Morillo-Flores, Yolanda Soria-Pérez, Nikita Shardin-Flores, Alejandro Menacho-Rivera, Jesús Huachallanqui-Salcedo. Violence and school coexistence in high school students of Cercado de Lima, Peru. - Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(3) (2020), 1-20. ISSN 1567-214X. 20 pages + 13 figures, 3 tables + 4 frames.**

**Keywords: school violence, bullying, school coexistence, aggression, exclusion.**

### ABSTRACT

This research has been focused on the study of the existing links between school violence and its dimensions in relation to school coexistence. The study presented the quantitative approach of non-experimental design and of a transversal, correlational type. The sample was conformed by 120 students of both genders whose ages fluctuated between 14 and 16 year-old, from an educational institution in Cercado de Lima. Two questionnaires were used for data collection: 1) school violence self-test with 50 items and 2) school coexistence with 30 items. The results showed the existence of a negative relationship (Spearman's rho = - , 235) for school violence versus school coexistence. It was concluded that as school violence increases, students' school coexistence deteriorates. Likewise, a series of solid approaches were presented to be taken into account and, in this way, reverse the growth of violence in schools

### INTRODUCTION

The problem that gravitates around school violence is a very hot topic that includes in itself different issues which generate social burden; a study that leads to viable solutions is therefore an arduous task (González and Treviño, 2019; Duru and Balkis, 2018; Giordano, Kaufman, Manning and Longmore, 2015). In this sense, Piñero, Areense, López and Torres (2014) declared, "Studying school violence and victimization means talking about one of the

problems that most concerns all members of the educational community" (p. 224). The onerous nature of the issue can be understood from the perspective of Pacheco (2018), who assumed that school violence is a systemic problem that has a negative impact on the social dynamics of educational activity; therefore, he defines it like: "An obstacle to improving educational quality, learning achievement, and the healthy development of students and teachers" (p.113). "There is little evidence of the most common forms of violence that tend to occur daily in schools, which possibly precede these serious cases, but are hardly ever reported" (Medina, Cruz, Trenche, and Baez, 2017, p.2).

Researchers Varela, Zimmerman, Ryan, Stoddard, Heinze, and Alfaro (2018) have found an association between school violence, as either a victim or a perpetrator, and levels of life satisfaction among young people, since, according to their observations, specifically adolescents who are involved in school violence report lower levels of life satisfaction compared to those who are not.

According to the aforementioned ideas, Leuschner, Fiedler, Schultze, Ahlig, Göbel, Sommer, Scholl and Scheithauer (2017) stated that there were hundreds of threats of severe school violence each year in Germany, an issue that has fostered the impression that schools are unsafe places, and thus this problem has triggered many preventive action proposals.

According to Cerda, Pérez, Elipe, Casas and Del Rey (2019), coexistence in schools seems to have been deteriorating, and quite often-violent episodes occur there. Likewise, the aforementioned authors stated that the media increasingly report this type of news that concerns all of society. The most important cases of coexistence usually derive from problems of indiscipline among students. On the other hand, Fernandez, Vigil and Gomez (2011) mentioned that coexistence in schools is a complex phenomenon since several factors converge in it; many of them refer to the relationships among the members of the educational community.

Andrades (2020), who made a review of studies done by UNESCO, stated, "School violence is a recurrent factor that is affecting educational institutions" (p.2). The studies carried out so far have provoked a wide debate on coexistence and have generated many terms. Sometimes these, instead of clarifying, have caused some confusion on the subject. In this regard, it is worth mentioning what Garcia, Grau, and Lopez (2017) have stated. They declare that if coexistence is built with action and the school is a scenario where continuous interactions occur, it seems appropriate to think of the school environment as a place to learn to live together; but they also added that studies aimed at understanding the impact of mediation are scarce.

Research on school violence carried out by López, Álvarez, Domínguez and Álvarez (2018) directed at 4943 students in compulsory secondary education (considered the stage of greatest conflict) in 33 public schools focused on the participants' point of view, and their opinions served to highlight crucial issues. In fact, their interpretation points to new responsibilities and procedures that guarantee safe teaching-learning contexts. On that basis, they identified the most prevalent types of school violence and analyzed differences in gender, grade and academic performance of student informants. They applied questionnaires, whose results showed the predominance of classroom interruption and student-to-student verbal violence, as well as differences in the level of perceived violence according to the variables analyzed. According to the authors, the study highlighted the broad typology of violence in schools and its daily occurrence in classrooms; therefore, they highlighted the need for effective prevention and intervention programs.

Similarly, Pacheco's study (2018) focused on learning about the notions and ideas concerning the causes of school violence in the Dominican Republic, through focus groups, in-depth interviews, ludic workshops and the non-participatory observation of 604 students and 23 teachers. The results showed the existence of marked gender stereotypes, slight traits of friendship and, especially, aspects related to violence as fun, which were found to be internalized. Finally, they concluded that there is an urgent need to implement programs to address and eliminate such marked school violence.

The evaluation study based on a standardized school prevention program developed by Leuschner et al. (2017) in 98 German schools, with 3473 participants combined a threat assessment approach with a general model of school-based emergency prevention through early intervention in students' psychosocial crises, and training teachers to recognize warning signs of targeted school violence. Research included a quasi-experimental comparison group design with three measurement points (before, after, and 7 months of follow-up) with schools randomly assigned to implementation conditions. This study found a rise in teacher experience and assessment skills, improved skills in identifying students who experience psychosocial crisis, and positive side effects; for example, teacher-student interaction and feelings of safety.

Research conducted by Sommer, Leuschner, and Scheithauer (2014) focused on a systematic search of the literature on school shootings, including 35 international primary studies. They selected cases in which a current or former student carried out a targeted violent attack, in an attempt to clarify the role of the perpetrators' negative social experiences with peers and teachers prior to their attack. They examined 126 cases (128 perpetrators) from 13 countries (United States, Canada, Germany, Finland, Brazil, Argentina, Australia, Bosnia, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, Sweden, and Thailand). The average age of the offenders was 19 years, and in 121 cases, the offenders were male. In 67 case reports, details were found about the social dynamics that contributed to the attack. This analysis revealed that in 88.1% of the cases, the aggressor had experienced social conflict within the school environment. A minority of the aggressors (29.9%) suffered physical harassment, while 53.7% experienced rejection by their peers, verbal or otherwise; in addition, romantic rejection was found in 29.9% of the cases. It should also be noted that conflicts with teachers (43.3%) proved to be a decisive factor.

Regarding school coexistence, the study of exploratory and confirmatory factorial analysis and of the estimation of the internal consistency carried out by Valdés, López and Chaparro (2018) was also consulted. The work was oriented to the adaptation and adjustment of a questionnaire applied to 2868 Chilean students. It was reported that the aspect of school coexistence was conformed by a series of inclusive, democratic practices and of peaceful solution of conflicts at classroom level.

The descriptive correlation study carried out by Cerda, Salazar, Guzmán and Narváez (2018) was oriented to compare the perception of school coexistence and its relationship with the academic performance of 75 secondary school students in Chile. In this regard, they found that students with special educational needs have a less favorable perception in almost all the dimensions analyzed; especially in those aspects related to school victimization, aggression and indiscipline. They also perceived that they have a limited social network of peers, as well as limited normative adjustment and less perception of their own positive interpersonal skills. Multiple regression and logistic regression models show that the dimensions

of school coexistence account for between 20% and 27% of the variability in academic performance. The models already mentioned highlight the role and negative effect of the level of victimization perceived by students, as well as the perception of the occurrence of situations of indiscipline in the classroom, in addition to the fact of belonging to the group of students with special educational needs and to the group of male students.

On the other hand, Conde, Azaustre and Méndez (2017) presented a work on the analysis of educational leadership in the management of school coexistence in Andalucía, Spain. For this purpose, they worked with 46 secondary schools with 46 teachers and 46 families as interviewees. The survey was applied in order to evaluate a series of variables that can be included in a model of committed and transforming leadership, which favors a positive climate of coexistence. The researchers concluded that a leadership committed to a culture of peace exerts a certain degree of influence on the management of school coexistence and the promotion of preventive measures.

Based on the problem of school violence and its link with aspects related to school coexistence, this research was oriented to determining the relationship between both variables, as well as the determination of the existing relationship between contempt, ridicule, intimidation, threats, coercion, restriction and aggressions towards school coexistence.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **SCHOOL VIOLENCE**

Violence, as a negative fact in itself, tends to generate onerous consequences that, a posteriori, will lead to the concatenation of problems of a very diverse nature in the individual who affected by it (Salcido and Urias, 2016). On the other hand, the WHO (2014) has considered that any act of violence is a serious violation of human rights. "Violence is considered a "relationship of power, bond or form of social relationship by which one of the terms exercises its accumulated power over the other" (Poujol, 2016, p.125). On the other hand, as referred to by Menesini and Salmivalli (2017), research on school bullying began more than forty years ago, when a group of perpetrators or an individual carried out aggressive and intentional acts, in a repeated and prolonged manner, against victims who could not easily defend themselves. According to these researchers bullying is one of the most common expressions of violence in the context of peers during the school years,.

School violence between peers is related to intentional and coercive behaviors of a physical, verbal nature that alter the relational links between the members of an educational community (Valdés, Martínez and Carlos, 2018). As explained by Varela et al. (2018), school climate and school satisfaction may help explain school violence and life satisfaction, but as mentioned earlier, few researchers have examined the underlying mechanisms between school violence and life satisfaction, considering school satisfaction as a mediating factor. A significant point is made by Varela et al. (2018) that involvement in school violence, whether as a victim or as a perpetrator, can have negative consequences for young people in school, which can affect their satisfaction levels and mental and academic health performance.

According to Pacheco (2018), the socially accepted construct of the masculine and feminine genders stands as one of the main pillars of school violence, a fact that will be maintained as long as the traditional stereotype of masculineness as well as attitudes of violence and discrimination are not overcome. A crucial aspect is that expressed by Leuschner et al. (2017) who

refer to the cases of selective school violence, not as mere spontaneous acts driven by affection resulting directly from the current situation. They declare that these acts are developed during a prolonged period of anguish, deliberation, and planning, which almost all seem to be driven by a personal psychosocial crisis, although multiple paths of development have already been identified. (Sommer et al., 2014).

As reported by López et al. (2018), research over the last few decades has highlighted the enormous impact of the phenomenon of school violence on the stage of school education, which damages the teaching-learning process, evolutionary development, and peaceful coexistence at school; besides, it generates negative consequences on well-being, psychological health, and social relationships as an extra value. A study by Longobardi, Prino, Fabris and Settanni (2019) on the Italian context declares that research on isolated incidents of sexual, physical and psychological victimization at school remains scarce.

There is broad consensus in several studies that examine the relationship between gender violence and school violence. The former is a relevant modulator variable, with a higher incidence in boys than in girls, in situations of strong social impact (physical and violent aggression), while incidence of low-intensity violence (rumors or insults) was higher for girls than for boys (Álvarez, Álvarez, González, Núñez y González, 2006; Estévez, Calvete, Orue, Villardón y Padilla, 2010). Regarding school violence victims, Menesini and Salmivalli (2017) pointed out that children with disabilities, refugees or those affected by migration, excluded children, minority group children, or simply children who differ from the peer group are always more vulnerable. School violence correlates with negative experiences for children and adolescents in the school context. There is specifically a negative relationship between the school climate, becoming a victim or a perpetrator of school violence, and the levels of school satisfaction in the lives of children and youngsters. (Varela et al., 2018).

Seen from another angle, there is a view expressed by Sommer et al. (2014) about the emergence of a wide range of studies on violence in schools. There are those that argue that, prior to their attack, perpetrators of school shootings had experienced intense conflict and problematic relationships, as for example, bullying from peers and teachers; furthermore, they were on the periphery of the schools social life. This, in turn, resulted in perpetrators seeing themselves as victims. However, methodological problems and inconsistencies mark many of these studies and the findings vary.

Oñate and Piñuel (2005) have addressed school violence or bullying as frequent and deliberate abuse of a student by one or more of his or her peers. "There is little research regarding the role of teaching practices in preventing school violence among students" (Valdés et al., 2018, p. 34).

### **SCHOOL COEXISTENCE**

According to Garcia et al. (2017), coexistence should be one of the educational pillars of the 21st century and school, a space where constant interactions takes place and where students spend a great deal of time, should be presented as a suitable social environment to learn to live together. In fact, these circumstances require that teachers constantly update themselves to respond more effectively to the current educational reality (Andrades, 2020). According to Valdés et al. (2018, p.81): "The term school coexistence is polysemic; its multiple definitions make the identification of the aspects that integrate it quite complex".

According to Sandoval (2014), what refers to school, coexistence can be subject to teaching-learning processes and, could therefore be executed directly or indirectly in the educational community, since it is an ideal space for socialization. On the other hand, UNESCO (2016) recognizes that school coexistence should be assumed as a mechanism oriented to the significant improvement of human interactions, which tends to the solution of conflicts, or acquires a prophylactic profile in cases of school violence or academic failure.

According to Minedu (2017), school coexistence is an aspect linked to school life; assuming the different forms and mechanisms of how interpersonal relationships are managed in an educational institution, based on its pedagogical mission. Similarly, the author emphasizes that school coexistence should be assumed as a pedagogical concept that takes into account the educational, preventive, and regulatory value that interpersonal relationships can have in school life. According to Villanueva, Usó and Adrián (2013), it is the ability that students have to interact with peers in an environment of solidarity and respect; taking into account, that such coexistence is determined by the links generated among the components of the institution, and that such links were established through rules of coexistence and style of participation.

In this regard, Romera, Ortega and Del Rey (2010) indicated that school coexistence is determined by those psychosocial features characteristic of an educational institution, which are defined by various factors such as structure, personal and functionality factors, which are dynamic and affect the processes within the institution. Likewise, Padilla and Rodríguez, (2019) assert that coexistence within the school should be the most appropriate one to allow students to acquire skills, abilities, attitudes and values that lead them to develop as individuals knowledgeable of their rights and compliers of their duties.

According to Garretón (2013), peaceful and harmonious school coexistence is assumed as the basis for a quality of life for the student, and it also propitiates learning. For this reason, the aforementioned author stated that learning and daily practice of social skills is required on the part of students, since these will prepare them to be able to assume and respond to problems and challenges that could arise in the future. Therefore, classrooms are the appropriate environments to strengthen the basic schemes of socialization. For Alemany (2012), coexistence at school implies interrelation mechanisms where all participants are responsible.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

For the present study, we opted for the non-experimental design, of a transversal type, since there was no manipulation of the variables. Researchers only observed the events to be examined in their real context. Correlation was also used to determine the level of connection of the variables (Hernández, Fernández and Baptista, 2014).

It is worth mentioning that the population was composed of 175 students from the third, fourth and fifth grades of secondary education in a public educational institution located in Cercado de Lima. In turn, the random sample used included 120 students, of both sexes, whose ages fluctuated between 14 and 16 years of age, as shown in Table 1.

---

Grade	Section	Period	Total
-------	---------	--------	-------

Third	A	Morning	15 students
Third	B	Morning	15 students
Third	C	Morning	10 students
Fourth	A	Morning	20 students
Fourth	B	Morning	20 students
Fifth	A	Morning	20 students
Fifth	B	Morning	20 students
Total			120 students

*Note: Taken from the students' enrollement list*

*Table 1. Sample of students in a public educational institution (IEP for its acronym in Spanish)*

With respect to the techniques used for this study, a survey was applied. According to Valderrama (2014), this is the instrument by which information is obtained, using questionnaires structured for that purpose. Two questionnaires were used: one of them to measure 'school violence' and the other one to measure 'school coexistence'. For the measurement of the first variable, the researchers used the 'Cisneros' self-test of school bullying' developed by Piñuel and Oñate (2008) from the Institute for Educational Innovation and Management Development (IEDI) in Spain. It consisted of 50 items that allowed evaluating the overall index of bullying, facilitating in turn the generation of a profile on the most common forms of 'school bullying' through the eight dimensions presented. The second instrument was the 'Observation card of school coexistence' developed by Ortega et al. (2001), which consisted of 30 items, and was adapted to the conditions of the study in order to identify the levels of coexistence within the classroom. The respective reliability analysis was carried out through the application of a pilot test and the results obtained are shown in table 2.

<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Elements</b>	<b>Test</b>	<b>Value</b>
School coexistence	30	Cronbach Alpha	0.860
Observation sheet of school coexistence	30	Kuder Richardson 20	0.862

*Nota: Pilot test*

*Table 2. Reliability analysis of the instruments*

## RESULTS

According to Table 3, in the responses obtained, 0.8% of the surveyed students indicated a very low level of school violence; for 3.3% it was low; for 10.8% it was quite low; for 21.7% it was medium; for 40.0% it was quite high; for 22.5% it was high; and for 0.8% it was very high. From these results, it could be inferred that the level of school violence for the students that were surveyed showed an upward trend.

		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Very low	1	8	0,8
	Low	4	3,3	4,2
	Quite low	13	10,8	15,0
	Medium	26	21,7	36,7
	Quite High	48	40,0	76,7

High	27	22,5	99,2
Very high	1	0,8	100,0
Total	120	100,0	

*Table 3. Levels of school violence in students on the IEP*

According to Table 4, 3.3% of students indicated a very low level of contempt and ridicule; they were low for 0.8% ; quite low for 11.7%; medium for 20.0%; quite high for 39.2%; high for 23.3%; and very high for 1.7%. From these results, it could be inferred that the level of the contempt and ridicule dimension in the students that were surveyed had a quite high tendency.

	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Low	4	3,3
	Quite low	1	0,8
	Medium	14	11,7
	Quite High	24	20,0
	High	47	39,2
	Very high	28	23,3
	Total	2	1,7
	Low	120	100,0

*Table 4. Levels of contempt and ridicule in students of the IEP.*

In Table 5 it was observed that, according to the perception of the students surveyed, 3.3% reported very low levels of intimidation and threats; they were low for 1.7%; quite low for 20.0%; medium for 40.0%; quite high for 30.8%; high for 3.3%; and very high for 0.8%. From these results, it could be inferred that the level of intimidation and threats in secondary school students has a medium trend.

	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Low	4	3,3
	Quite low	2	1,7
	Medium	24	20,0
	Quite High	48	40,0
	High	37	30,8
	Very high	4	3,3
	Total	1	0,8
	Low	120	100,0

*Table 5. Levels of the intimidation and threats dimension in students in the IEP.*

According to what is displayed in Table 6, regarding students' perception of the studied IEP, 0.8% indicated having a quite low level of coercion; it was medium for 7.5%; for 36.7% it was quite high; it was high for 50.8%, while for 4.2% it was very high. From these results, it could be inferred that the level of coercion of high school students has a high tendency.

	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Quite low	1	,8
	Medium	9	7,5
	Quite High	44	36,7
	High	61	50,8
	Very high	5	4,2



Total	120	100,0
-------	-----	-------

Table 6. Levels of the coercion dimension in students in the IEP.

According to what is shown in Table 7 regarding student's perception of the IEP studied, 0.8% of the students indicated that they identified themselves with a very low level of communication restriction; while for 3.3% it low; quite low for 30.0%; medium for 42.5%; quite high for 21.7%; and high for only 1.7%. From these results, it could be inferred as a conclusion that the level of communication restriction in the students surveyed had an average tendency.

		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Very low	1	0,8	0,8
	Quite low	4	3,3	4,2
	Medium	36	30,0	34,2
	Quite High	51	42,5	76,7
	High	26	21,7	98,3
	Very high	2	1,7	100,0
	Total	120	100,0	

Table 7. Levels of communication restriction in students of the IEP.

According to what is shown in Table 8 regarding the students' perception of the IEP studied, 1.7% reported a very low level of verbal harassment; it was low for 3.3%; quite low for 17.5%; medium for 28.3%; quite high for 35.8%; and high for 13.3%,. From the results obtained, it was concluded that the level of verbal harassment in the IEP students had a quite high tendency.

		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Very low	2	1,7	1,7
	Quite low	4	3,3	5,0
	Medium	21	17,5	22,5
	Quite High	34	28,3	50,8
	High	43	35,8	86,7
	Very high	16	13,3	100,0
	Total	120	100,0	

Table 8. Levels of Verbal Harassment in IEP Students

Según lo que se muestra en la tabla 9 respecto de la percepción de los alumnos de la IEP estudiada, el 1.7% indicó tener muy bajo nivel de agresiones; el 3.3% fue bajo; el 20.8%, casi bajo; el 42.5%, medio; el 25%, casi alto y solo un 6,7%, alto. De los resultados obtenidos, se concluyó que el nivel de agresión en los estudiantes de la IEP tuvo una tendencia media.

According to what is shown in Table 9 regarding the student's perception of the IEP under study, 1.7% indicated a very low level of aggression; 3.3% indicated it was low; 20.8% said it was quite low; 42.5% declared it was medium; 25% indicated it was quite high; and only 6.7% considered it high. From the results obtained, it was concluded that the level of aggression in the IEP students had a medium trend.

		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Very low	2	1,7	1,7
	Quite low	4	3,3	5,0
	Medium	25	20,8	25,8
	Quite High	51	42,5	68,3

High	30	25,0	93,3
Very high	8	6,7	100,0
Total	120	100,0	

Table 9. Levels of Aggression in IEP Students,

According to what is shown in Table 10, regarding the students' perception of the IEP under study, 15% indicated that they had an inadequate level of school coexistence; for 58.3% it was regular and 26.7% indicated that it was adequate. From these results, it could be inferred that the level of school coexistence in students of the IEP was identified with a regular trend.

		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Inadequate	18	15.0	15.0
	Regular	70	58.3	73.3
	Adequate	32	26.7	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	

Table 10. Levels of the school coexistence variable for students in the IEP.

According to what is shown in Table 11 regarding the students' perception in the IEP under study, 20.8% indicated that they had an inadequate level of the "learning to live together" dimension; while 70.8% indicated that they perceived it as regular, and only 8.3% stated that they were at the adequate level. From these results, it could be inferred that the level of the indicated dimension had a regular trend in the students of the IEP.

		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Inadequate	25	20.8	20.8
	Regular	85	70.8	91.7
	Adequate	10	8.3	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	

Table 11. Levels of the "learning to live together" dimension for the IEP students.

According to what is shown in Table 12 regarding students' perception of the IEP under study, 17.5% said they had an inadequate level of the "learn to relate" dimension; while 67.5% said it was regular, and only 15.5% said it was adequate. From these results, it could be inferred that the level of the indicated dimension had a regular trend in the students of the analyzed IEP.

		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Inadequate	21	17.5	17.5
	Regular	81	67.5	85.0
	Adequate	18	15.5	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	

Table 12. Levels of the 'learning to relate' dimension for the IEP students.

According to what is shown in Table 13 regarding students' perception of the IEP under study, 18.3% indicated that they had an inadequate level of the 'learn to meet standards' dimension; while 72.5% said that it was regular, and only 9.2% said that it was adequate. From these results, it could be inferred that the level of the indicated dimension had a regular trend in the students of the analyzed IEP.

		Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid	Inadequate	22	18.3	18.3
	Regular	87	72.5	90.8
	Adequate	11	9.2	100.0
	Total	120	100.0	

Table 13. Levels of the learning to meet standards' dimension for the IEP students

			School Violence	School Coexistence
Spearman's Rho	School Violence	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,235*
		Sig. (bilateral)		,010
		N	120	120
	Coexistence	Correlation Coefficient	-,235*	1,000
		Sig. (bilateral)	,010	
		N	120	120

The results obtained through statistical analysis, as displayed in Table 14, showed that a negative relationship occurred, since the value of Spearman's rho coefficient was -0.235 with a significance level of  $p = 0.01$  ( $p < 0.05$ ), which allowed researchers to argue that as school violence increases, school coexistence deteriorates in high school students.

Table 14. Correlation between 'school violence' and 'school coexistence' for IEP students

			Dimension	School Coexistence
Spearman's Rho	Contempt and ridicule	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-0.230**
		Sig. (bilateral)	-	0.018
	Intimidation and threats	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-0.272**
		Sig. (bilateral)	-	0.04
	Coercion	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-0.261**
		Sig. (bilateral)	-	0.01
	Communication Restriction	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-0.195**
		Sig. (bilateral)	-	0.035
	Exclusion	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-0.162**
		Sig. (bilateral)	-	0.025
	Verbal Harassment	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-0.253**
		Sig. (bilateral)	-	0.023
	Aggressions	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-0.176**
		Sig. (bilateral)	-	0.01
		N	120	120

Table 15 shows the results of the statistical analysis for the dimensions of the variable 'school violence' versus 'school coexistence'. According to the values generated by this analysis, 'contempt and ridicule' increased; therefore, school coexistence has deteriorated in the students surveyed since the Spearman's Rho value obtained in the students surveyed was (-0.230). In addition, 'intimidation and threats' have deteriorated, as compared to 'school coexistence' (-0.272). Similarly, the dimensions of 'coercion' (-0.261), 'communication restriction' (-0.195), 'exclusion' (-0.162), 'verbal harassment' (-0.253) and 'aggression' (-0.176) have deteriorated compared to 'school coexistence' in the 120 students of the IEP.

Table 15. Correlation between the dimensions of the variable 'school violence' and the variable 'school coexistence' for the IEP students.

**DISCUSSION**

According to the statistical analysis, the results show the existence of an inverse relationship (Spearman's rho = - .235) between school violence and school coexistence. This result can be interpreted as that the greater the number of cases of violence within the school, the lower the tendency for

school coexistence, which, according to the data provided, would lead the victims of such events to engage in behavior that would slow down their progress. In this regard, a special fact is that mentioned by Lopez et al. (2018) in terms of school performance, since their data revealed a higher incidence of all types of school violence in students who repeated a school academic year or failed subjects. In contrast, a safe school environment, characterized by limited school violence, provides a context for students to thrive, develop autonomy, a sense of competence, and be more likely to participate in school-related activities (Varela et al., 2018).

Likewise, it should be noted that the results for aspects related to school violence such as contempt and ridicule were inversely related to school coexistence (Spearman's  $\rho = -.230$ ). Similar results were obtained for bullying and threats (-.272), co-participation (-.261), restriction of communication (-.195) and social exclusion and blocking (-.162), verbal harassment (-.253) and aggressions (-.176) in relation to school coexistence. This could indicate that the more these dimensions are perceived in the school environment, the more they tend to negatively influence on aspects related to school coexistence, thus generating by their nature an alteration of the developmental links within the school community.

According to Piñero et al. (2014), there are various studies that have revealed in their results considerable differences when comparing genders, specifically with regard to verbal aggression or social exclusion, since a hostile school environment and negative interactions with peers are associated with lower levels of school satisfaction (Varela et al., 2018).

## CONCLUSION

The results obtained by Crespo, Romero, Martínez and Musitu (2017) highlighted the importance of youth participation and involvement in community activities in order to attenuate their relationship with school violence; this will help improve the various indicators of psychosocial adjustment such as self-esteem, life satisfaction and loneliness. There is variation among schools in how they implement prevention programs. Even programs that were designed to be intensive can be implemented more or less intensively, depending on the resources and commitment of the schools (Duru and Balkis, 2018).

The findings of Crespo et al. (2017) showed that it is possible to reduce the cases of school violence, encouraging young people who suffer from this condition to participate in community activities, if they identify themselves with them. This was found to be associated with a reversal in the development of violent behavior, as well as a decreasing in verbal aggressions and insults towards others. According to Varela et al. (2018), victims of school violence may need more environmental support to manage violent episodes; therefore, there should be generated viable strategies that play a fundamental role in helping students who have been victims of violent behavior.

We agree with Gonzáles and Triviño (2019), who stated that a greater quantity and quality of research related to school violence would provide guidelines for taking preventive actions, since only by knowing about errors from the past or from others, will they be avoided in the present and will disappear in the future.

As a solution, we can think of a leadership committed to the culture of peace as conceived by Conde et al. (2017). It is a fundamental aspect and a basis for the construction of school coexistence, identified with an executive team that defines a model of coexistence, which generates the necessary changes in both attitudes and behaviors, and facilitates activities of

continuous improvement. Another aspect highlighted by the aforementioned authors is the creation of a school coexistence committee, which they consider as a fundamental element in the management and channelling of the initiatives of all sectors of the educational community in order to improve coexistence and mutual respect, thus promoting a culture of peace and peaceful conflict resolution.

It is especially relevant to give due importance to the plans for coexistence adopted in the schools, since they must reflect the measures, rules and actions to be followed by the educational community (González, Hortigüela Hernando y Pérez, 2019). The coexistence plan and its approaches, which have not been traditionally applied in the field of teaching, due to its fundamentally theoretical character, become an opportunity and a fundamental tool to establish comprehensive frameworks of actions shared by students, teachers and families.

According to what has been discussed, there is a marked consensus with Park, Dimitrov and Park (2018), who point out that coexistence plans must be written down, as one of the basic pillars that support life in educational centers. In fact, this helps to see centers places where, in addition to receiving daily classes, values such as communication and collaboration are also shared.

Another aspect to take into account is that expressed by Frías, Rodríguez, Corral, Caso y García (2018), who made it clear that, despite considerable efforts to address the problem of school violence by improving the school environment, the rates of victimization due to bullying, harassment and abuse within the student body have not improved. Furthermore, there is no evidence that school suspensions and punishments are effective in preventing disruptive behavior in school (Macias, 2019). Therefore, an alternative response worldwide has been restorative justice, previously adopted as restorative practices. Assuming premises of aspects related to restorative justice aims to address the problem of school violence in a comprehensive manner by improving the school environment and considering the needs of the victim(s), offender(s), teacher(s), and school authorities.

## REFERENCES

- Andrades-Moya, J. (2020). School Coexistence in Latin America: A Literature Review. *Revista Electrónica Educare*, 24(2), 346-368. <http://doi.org/10.15359/ree.24-2.17>
- Alemany, I. (2012). Convivencia escolar: percepciones de los profesores de Primaria y Secundaria de la Ciudad Autónoma de Melilla.
- Álvarez, L., Álvarez-García, D., González-Castro, P., Núñez, J., & González-Pienda, J. (2006). Evaluation of violent behaviors in secondary school. *Psicothema*, 18(4), 686-695.
- Cerda, G., Pérez, C., Elipe, P., Casas, J., & Del Rey, R. (2019). School Coexistence and Its Relationship with Academic Performance Among Primary Education Students. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 24(1), 46-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicoe.2018.06.001>
- Cerda, G., Salazar, Y., Guzmán, C., & Narváez, G. (2018). Impact of the School Coexistence on Academic Performance According to Perception of Typically Developing and Special Educational Needs Students. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 6(1), 275-300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2018.v6n1.194>
- Conde-Vélez, S., Azaustre-Lorenzo, M., & Méndez-Garrido, J. (2017). Leadership: its importance in the management of school coexistence. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 237, 169-174. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2017.02.059>

- Crespo-Ramos, S., Romero-Abrio, A., Martínez-Ferrer, B., & Musitu, G. (2017). Variables psicosociales y violencia escolar en la adolescencia. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 26(2), 125-130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psi.2017.05.002>
- Duru, E., & Balkis, M. (2018). Exposure to school violence at school and mental health of victimized adolescents: The mediation role of social support. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 76, 342-352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.11.016>
- Estévez, A., Villardón, L., Calvete, E., Padilla, P., & Orue, I. (2010). Adolescentes víctimas de cyberbullying: prevalencia, y características. *Behavioral Psychology/Psicología Conductual*. 1. 73-89
- Fernández, S., Vigil, M., & Gómez, M. (2011). The evaluation of school coexistence in contexts of cultural diversity. *Exedra: Revista Científica*, (3), 33-50.
- Frias-Armentia, M., Rodríguez-Macías, J., Corral-Verdugo, V., Caso-Niebla, J., & García-Arizmendi, V. (2018). Restorative justice: A model of school violence prevention. *Science Journal of Education*, 6(1), 39-45.
- García-Raga, L., Grau, R., & López-Martín, R. (2017). Mediation as a process for the management of conflict and the improvement of coexistence in educational centres. A study based on the perceptions of secondary school students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 237, 465-470. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2017.02.091>
- Garretón-Valdivia, P. (2013). *Estado de la convivencia escolar, conflictividad y su forma de abordarla en establecimientos educacionales de alta vulnerabilidad social de la Provincia de Concepción, Chile* [tesis doctoral. Universidad de Córdoba. Chile].
- Giordano, P., Kaufman, A., Manning, W., & Longmore, M. (2015). Teen dating violence: the influence of friendships and school context. *Sociological Focus*, 48(2), 150-171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2015.1007024>
- González-Calvo, G., Hortigüela-Alcalá, D., Hernando-Garijo, A., & Pérez-Pueyo, Á. (2019). The Coexistence Plan at a Secondary School: Analysis Based on the Voices of Students and Teachers. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(3), 572-585. <https://bit.ly/3jpfzhl>
- González-Medina, M., & Treviño-Villarreal, D. (2019). Violencia escolar en bachillerato: algunas estrategias para su prevención desde diferentes perspectivas. *Teoría de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 31(1), 123-147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14201/teri.19616>
- Hernández, R., Fernández, C., & Baptista, P. (2014). *Metodología de la investigación*. (6.ª ed.). México: Educación
- León-Moreno, C., Martínez-Ferrer, B., Musitu-Ochoa, G., & Moreno-Ruiz, D. (2019). Victimización y violencia escolar: el rol de la motivación de venganza, evitación y benevolencia en adolescentes. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 24(2), 88-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicod.2018.12.001>
- Leuschner, V., Fiedler, N., Schultze, M., Ahlig, N., Göbel, K., Sommer, F., Scholl, J., & Scheithauer, H. (2017). Prevention of targeted school violence by responding to students' psychosocial crises: The NETWASS program. *Child development*, 88(1), 68-82. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12690>
- Longobardi, C., Prino, L. E., Fabris, M. A., & Settanni, M. (2019). Violence in school: An investigation of physical, psychological, and sexual victimization reported by Italian adolescents. *Journal of school violence*, 18(1), 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2017.1387128>

- López-Castedo, A., Álvarez-García, D., Domínguez-Alonso, J., & Álvarez-Roales, E. (2018). Expressions of school violence in adolescence. *Psicothema*, 30(4), 395-400. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2018.130>
- Macías-Navarro, J. (2019). Promoting Peaceful Coexistence in Schools: An Important Role for Educators. *International Journal for Professional Educators*, 85, 9-17.
- Medina-Santiago, N., Cruz-Rivera, T., Trenche-Rodríguez, M., & Báez-Ávila, L. (2017). Estudio participativo para el desarrollo de un instrumento de observación de violencia escolar. *Ambito de encuentros*, 10(2), 48-54
- Menesini, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2017). Bullying in schools: the state of knowledge and effective interventions. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 22(1), 240-253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2017.1279740>
- Minedu. (2017). *Rutas de aprendizaje: Convivir, participar y deliberar para ejercer una ciudadanía democrática e intercultural*. Lima: Ministerio de Educación.
- Organización Mundial de la Salud: OMS (2014). *La prevención de la violencia: evaluación de los resultados de programas de educación para padres*. Ginebra: Organización Mundial de la Salud.
- Ortega-Ruiz, R., Rey-Alamillo, R., & Mora-Merchán, J. (2001). Violencia entre escolares: conceptos y etiquetas verbales que definen el fenómeno del maltrato entre iguales. *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, (41), 95-113.
- Pacheco-Salazar, B. (2018). Violencia escolar: la perspectiva de estudiantes y docentes. *Revista electrónica de investigación educativa*, 20(1), 112-121. <https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2018.20.1.1523>
- Park, M., Dimitrov, D., & Park, D. (2018). Effects of background variables of early childhood teachers on their concerns about inclusion: The mediation role of confidence in teaching. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 32(2), 165-180. doi:10.1080/02568543.2017.1417926
- Padilla-Fuentes, G., & Rodríguez-Garcés, C. (2019). School Coexistence in Chile: An Analysis Based on the New Educational Quality Measurement Framework. *Revista Educación*, 43(2), 571-587.
- Piñero-Ruiz, E., Areñse-Gonzalo, J., López-Espín, J., & Torres-Cantero, A. (2014). Incidencia de la violencia y victimización escolar en estudiantes de educación secundaria obligatoria en la Región de Murcia. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 32(1), 223-241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/rie.32.1.154251>
- Piñuel, I., & Oñate-Cantero, A. (2008). *Informe Cisneros VII violencia y acoso escolar en alumnos de primaria, eso y bachiller. Informe preliminar*. Instituto de Innovación Educativa y Desarrollo Directivo.
- Poujol-Galván, G. (2016). Puntos de articulación entre violencia social, exclusión y violencia escolar. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Educativos*, 46(2), 123-144.
- Romera, E., Del Rey, R., & Ortega, R. (2011). Factores Asociados a la Implicación en Bullying: Un Estudio en Nicaragua. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 20(2), 161-170.
- Salcido-Cibrián, L., & Urías-Aguirre, K. (2016). Educación emocional en casos de violencia y victimización escolar: propuesta de intervención. *Opción*, 32(12), 2088-2102.
- Sandoval-Manríquez, M. (2014) Convivencia y clima escolar: claves de la gestión del conocimiento. *Última década*, 22(41), 153-178. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-22362014000200007>

- Sommer, F., Leuschner, V., & Scheithauer, H. (2014). Bullying, romantic rejection, and conflicts with teachers: The crucial role of social dynamics in the development of school shootings - A systematic review. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 8, 3-24. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/DEV-140129>
- Unesco. (2016). Respuestas del Sector de Educación Frente al Bullying Homofóbico. Cuadernillo 8, Serie *Buenas Políticas y Prácticas para la Educación en VIH y Salud*.
- Valderrama, G. (2014). Metodología de la Investigación Científica. Lima: Edición Aula Abierta
- Valdés-Cuervo, Á., Martínez-Ferrer, B., & Carlos-Martínez, E. A. (2018). El rol de las prácticas docentes en la prevención de la violencia escolar entre pares. *Revista de psicodidáctica*, 23(1), 33-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicod.2017.05.006>
- Valdés-Morales, R., López, V., & Chaparro-Caso, A. (2018). Convivencia escolar: adaptación y validación de un instrumento mexicano en Chile. *Revista electrónica de investigación educativa*, 20(3), 80-91. <https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2018.20.3.1720>
- Varela, J., Zimmerman, M., Ryan, A., Stoddard, S., Heinze, J., & Alfaro, J. (2018). Life satisfaction, school satisfaction, and school violence: A mediation analysis for Chilean adolescent victims and perpetrators. *Child Indicators Research*, 11(2), 487-505. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12187-016-9442-7>
- Villanueva-Badenes, L., Usó-Guiral, I., & Adrián-Serrano, J. (2013). Los programas de mediación entre iguales: una herramienta eficaz para la convivencia escolar. *Apuntes de Psicología*, 31(2), 165-171.