

Comparative Analysis of the Perception of School Violence in Teachers, Pupils, and Families

José Jesús Gázquez Linares, Adolfo Javier Cangas Díaz,
María del Carmen Pérez Fuentes, and Francisca Lucas Acién
Universidad de Almería (Spain)

The main aim of the present study is to analyze the opinion of pupils, families and teachers in four European countries (Spain, Hungary, Austria and the Czech Republic) on the prevalence of violent behavior and other problematic aspects related to coexistence in schools, and on the way in which individuals are personally affected by them. For this purpose, a single instrument was used. From the results obtained it emerges, first of all, that there are significant differences depending on who is analyzing the school problems. Generally, families perceive the problems analyzed as less common and feel less affected by them personally. Hungary was considered to be the country with the lowest levels of school violence. Pupils indicate their concern about the high levels of lack of motivation or boredom, whilst teachers are more preoccupied about the serious problems of coexistence, due in particular to the presence or use of weapons and drugs and to intercultural conflicts.

Keywords: bullying, Europe, families, teachers, pupils

El objetivo principal de este estudio es analizar la opinión de alumnos, familias y profesores en cuatro países europeos (España, Hungría, Austria y la República Checa) sobre la prevalencia del comportamiento violento y otros aspectos problemáticos relacionados con la convivencia en la escuela, y sobre la forma en que los individuos se ven afectados personalmente por ellos. Para ello, se empleó un solo instrumento. De los resultados, se observa, primero, que hay diferencias significativas en función de quién analiza los problemas de la escuela. En general, las familias perciben los problemas analizados como menos habituales y se sienten menos afectados por ellos. Hungría se consideró el país con los niveles más bajos de violencia escolar. Los alumnos comentan su preocupación por los altos niveles de falta de motivación o aburrimiento, mientras que los profesores están más preocupados por los problemas serios de convivencia, debidos en particular a la presencia o el uso de armas y drogas y a los conflictos interculturales.

Palabras clave: violencia escolar, Europa, familias, profesores, alumnos

This paper is part of a research project financed by the Commission for Education and Culture of the European Union.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. José Jesús Gázquez Linares, Universidad de Almería, Facultad de Psicología y CC.EE., Dpto. Psicología Evolutiva y de la Educación, Carretera Sacramento S/N, 04120 Almería (Spain). Phone: 950015598. Fax: 950015083. E-mail: jlinares@ual.es

How to cite the authors of this article: Gázquez Linares, J.J., Cangas Díaz, A.J., Pérez Fuentes, M.C. and Lucas Acien, F.

Violence, which is ubiquitous in today's society, is influenced by numerous factors, including a range of sociocultural variables. Thus, factors such as poverty, marginalization, social conflict, loss of values or anomie contribute to its manifestation (Kim & Pridemore, 2005). Likewise, in the context of young people, various studies have stressed the relevance of the content of television programs and the mass media (Browne & Hamilton-Giachritsis, 2005; Hogan, 2005), videogames (Arriaga, Esteves, Carneiro, & Monteiro, 2006; Rodríguez, 2002) or the relaxation of obedience to family rules (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozano, 2003) as factors affecting this phenomenon.

In the school environment, the most common type of violence occurs amongst peers, and is known as *bullying*. Its prevalence is above 10% (Eslea et al., 2003), and recent works have indicated that it is on the increase, especially among boys (Brown, Birch, & Kancherla, 2005).

The social reality of young people of school age is marked basically by three agents: family, peer group and teachers. Numerous recent studies have explored the opinions of the young people involved (bullies and victims of bullying) (Eslea et al., 2003; Brown, et al., 2005), of teachers (Meyer, Astor, & Behre, 2002; Chapell, et al., 2004; Fisher & Kettl, 2003) and families (Eslea & Smith, 2000). However, one of the problems encountered in the results of these studies is that different instruments have been applied to assess this situation, making it difficult to compare the opinions of the various agents (Griffin & Gross, 2004).

It is also important to compare the reality of school violence across countries, especially if they have different sociopolitical systems, or are influenced by different cultural values. Although this a generalized phenomenon (Smith et al., 1999; Eslea et al., 2003), there may also be significant differences between countries, so that it is particularly relevant to carry out cross-cultural studies that reveal the potential differences and similarities (Kos, 2003; Neslade & Naito, 2005; Krug, et al., 2003; Sherer & Karnieli-Miller, 2004).

As a result, the current study focuses on analyzing the views of the three agents involved (pupils, families and teachers) with regard to the level of prevalence and repercussion of the various conflicts affecting school coexistence, and the differences of opinion on this matter in four European countries (Spain, Hungary, Austria, and the Czech Republic).

Method

Participants

The sample examined consisted of a total of 3259 participants (teachers, families and pupils) from four European countries (Spain, Hungary, Austria and the Czech Republic) and a total of 25 schools [10 from Spain (two from a rural environment and the rest from an urban environment), 5 from Hungary (all of them located in an urban area), 5 from Austria (one from a rural environment and four from an urban environment) and 5 from the Czech Republic (two from a rural environment and three from an urban environment)]. All of these were state educational establishments. Table 1 shows the number of participants from each country. With regard to the pupils, the age and gender of participants was recorded, the average age being 14.42 ($SD = 1.24$) [for Spain the average age is 14.53 ($SD = 1.25$), for Hungary it is 14 ($SD = 1.05$), for Austria it is 13.68 ($SD = 1.30$), and for the Czech Republic it is 15.45 ($SD = 1.32$)]. The proportion of females (53.4%) was slightly higher than that of males (46.6%) (in Spain 50.9% were male, while 48.9% were female; in Hungary 35.8% were male while 64.2% were female; in Austria 53.7% were male while 46.3% were female; and in the Czech Republic 45.8% were male while 54.2% were female).

Instrument

Questionnaire on Difficulties for School Coexistence (Gázquez, Cangas, Padilla, Cano, & Pérez-Moreno, 2005). This is a questionnaire by Ortega and del Rey (2003) that was adapted for its application to pupils, teachers and parents. It includes 26 items, each with four response alternatives: (a) high incidence, (b) moderate, (c) slight, and (d) non-existent. It is subdivided in two subscales of 13 items each. In the first part, teachers/families/pupils are asked to rate the extent to which the 13 situations potentially affecting school coexistence exist in their schools, while in the second, they are asked to rate to what extent they are personally affected by these situations. The first subscale, which refers to the problems perceived at the school, has two dimensions: the first one (Factor 1) refers to "common" or "mild" coexistence problems, which would include insults, fights, lack of incentive amongst pupils, confrontation

Table 1
Distribution of Teachers, Families, and Pupils by Country

Country	Teachers	Families	Pupils	Total
Spain	137	389	876	1402
Hungary	133	245	271	649
Austria	17	114	311	442
Czech Rep.	69	140	557	766
Total	356	888	2015	3259

between pupils and teachers, lack of precise rules, foul language, rival groups, children who fail to integrate, teachers who lack commitment and pupils who think their teachers do not understand them. The second dimension (Factor 2) refers to more “serious” problems, including the use or presence of drugs, the use or presence of weapons and problems of intercultural coexistence. The second subscale, on how participants are personally affected by these problems, has three dimensions. Whilst the “serious” problems dimension (Factor 2) remains the same as in the previous subscale, the “mild” problems dimension is subdivided in two. The first of these (Factor 1a) refers to problems that occur among pupils (insults, fights, conflicts between pupils and teachers, lack of clear rules, foul language, groups that do not coexist amicably, non-integrated children) and the second dimension (Factor 1b) is related to lack of motivation (non-committal teachers, pupils who think their teachers don’t understand them, and pupils who are not motivated). The reliability of this instrument, measured by means of Cronbach’s alpha, was .891 (by subscales, .823 for Problems Perceived at the School and .851 for Personal Repercussions) (Gázquez, et al., 2005).

Procedure

First of all, the questionnaire was translated from Spanish into the other three languages (German, Czech and Hungarian), following the guidelines of Muñiz and Hambleton (1996). A random selection of secondary schools was then carried out to apply the *Questionnaire on Difficulties for School Coexistence*. Once the selection was made, we contacted the

Headteachers and Heads of Studies at each school to obtain their consent, and then proceeded to apply the questionnaire to all the teachers and pupils at each school. Families were summoned and the general points of the study were explained to them. Finally, the questionnaire was delivered to the group.

Results

For the data analysis we transformed the four rating levels (*non-existent, slight, moderate and high incidence*) into numerical and quantitative scores, where *non-existent* corresponded to a score of 0, *slight* to 1, *moderate* to 2, and *high presence* to 3. Analyzing the scores attained by the three types of participants in the different factors by country (Table 2), we found that Hungary is the country with the fewest coexistence problems and the lowest personal repercussion perceived. To be specific, Hungarian pupils show the lowest score of all the countries in all the dimensions; this is also the case of families, with the exception of the personal repercussions of “serious” coexistence problems. Teachers report a low prevalence of “mild” problems, but a high prevalence of “serious” problems (with strong personal repercussions). On the other hand, high scores are found in the Czech Republic and Austria. Thus, Czech families are the ones that have the highest scores in all the dimensions. Pupils from this country also report a high prevalence of problems, both “mild” (Factor 1) and “serious” (Factor 2). Austria is the country where teachers perceive the highest rate of “serious” problems, together with the greatest personal repercussions (Factor 2). As far as Spain is concerned,

Table 2
Subscales of Prevalence and Level of Repercussions by Factor (Country). Descriptive Statistics

Subscale	Factors	Type	Spain			Hungary			Austria			Czech Republic		
			N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Prevalence of problems	F. 1	T	102	1.56	0.551	127	0.97	0.340	17	1.36	0.436	50	1.54	0.409
		F	273	1.35	0.615	226	1.00	0.470	103	1.52	0.551	106	1.63	0.471
		P	673	1.54	0.559	258	1.19	0.469	269	1.67	0.470	508	1.65	0.497
	F. 2	T	133	0.72	0.562	130	0.90	0.487	17	1.10	0.675	65	0.74	0.583
		F	363	0.57	0.662	239	0.48	0.410	109	0.85	0.724	129	1.05	0.754
		P	867	0.75	0.711	263	0.36	0.443	297	0.81	0.690	532	1.01	0.737
Level of personal repercussions	F. 1a	T	107	1.61	0.898	128	0.75	0.397	11	1.16	0.594	53	1.14	0.458
		F	284	0.81	0.706	225	0.62	0.446	100	1.32	0.728	103	1.29	0.703
		P	813	1.15	0.748	262	0.69	0.511	272	1.58	0.613	522	1.15	0.640
	F. 1b	T	105	1.76	0.834	130	1.01	0.323	14	1.26	0.396	54	1.09	0.655
		F	284	1.12	0.858	239	0.66	0.484	101	1.15	0.778	106	1.47	0.774
		P	820	1.48	0.850	265	1.01	0.723	293	1.34	0.697	534	1.54	0.746
	F. 2	T	129	1.26	1.157	133	2.49	0.397	17	2.53	0.355	67	0.57	0.544
		F	361	0.51	0.808	237	0.73	0.404	102	0.60	0.639	120	0.93	0.815
		P	859	0.94	0.956	264	0.21	0.402	292	0.77	0.657	531	0.71	0.719

Note. T = Teachers, F = Families, P = Pupils.

Spanish teachers are the ones that report the greatest personal repercussions of “mild” coexistence problems (Factors 1a and 1b), whilst Spanish pupils stress the personal repercussions of “serious” problems (Factor 2).

The mixed 2 × 2 (Countries × Agents) factorial design was carried out with the following ANOVA, which reveals the existence of the significant differences in every variable for every factor in function of the different groups (Countries and Agents) and also for the interaction between both groups (Countries x Agents) as shown in Table 3.

An analysis of the interaction between both groups (Countries x Agents) based in the estimated marginal means and applying the Bonferroni test for the multiple comparisons shows us (Tables 4 and 5), if we analyze the opinion of teachers, families and students in function of the country they belong to significant differences between

the means of the rates of the agents in different factors except in the Czech Republic for the Factor 1 of prevalence, $F(2, 2700) = 0.997, p > .05$, and for the Factor 1a of personal repercussion, $F(2, 2700) = 1.860, p > .05$; as in Hungary for the last factor, $F(2, 2700) = 1.766, p > .05$; and lastly, in Austria for the Factor 2 of prevalence, $F(2, 2700) = 1.551, p > .05$, and the Factor 1b of personal repercussion, $F(2, 2700) = 2.500, p > .05$.

In order to ascertain whether there were differences between the various opinions (both in the total sample and by country) expressed by the teachers, families and pupils we applied a one-factor ANOVA test. To establish where the differences occurred between the groups we used *post hoc* multiple comparisons, specifically Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference Test, which would also permit us to establish homogeneous subsets at a confidence level of 95% ($\alpha = .05$).

Table 3
Subscales of Prevalence and Level of Repercussions. Univariate ANOVA

Subscale	Factors	Type	Between-group effects	SS	df	RMS	F	p
Prevalence of problems	F. 1	T	Countries	81.24	3	27.08	102.425	.000
		F	Agents	10.24	2	5.12	19.370	.000
		P	Interaction (C x A)	5.64	6	.94	3.560	.002
	F. 2	T	Countries	34.63	3	11.54	26.811	.000
		F	Agents	2.83	2	1.41	3.294	.037
		P	Interaction (C x A)	33.17	6	5.52	12.842	.000
Level of personal repercussions	F. 1a	T	Countries	98.46	3	32.82	75.469	.000
		F	Agents	8.45	2	4.23	9.726	.000
		P	Interaction (C x A)	36.10	6	6.01	13.838	.000
	F. 1b	T	Countries	103.22	3	34.40	60.512	.000
		F	Agents	25.77	2	12.88	22.668	.000
		P	Interaction (C x A)	27.44	6	4.57	8.043	.000
	F. 2	T	Countries	54.40	3	18.13	30.644	.000
		F	Agents	180.57	2	90.28	152.579	.000
		P	Interaction (C x A)	324.06	6	54.01	91.274	.000

Note. T = Teachers, F = Families, P = Pupils, C = Country, A = Agents, RMS = Quadratic mean.

Table 4
Prevalence Shown by the Agents in Terms if the Different Countries. Univariate ANOVA (Bonferroni). Interaction between Groups: Countries and Agents

Factors	Subscale: Prevalence of Problems							
	F.1 (T-F-P)				F.2 (T-F-P)			
	Difference between means	Difference between means	Difference between means	F	Difference between means	Difference between means	Difference between means	F
Spain	T-F **	T-P	F-P **	15.423	T-F	T-P	F-P **	10.047
Hungary	T-F	T-P **	F-P **	12.067	T-F **	T-P **	F-P	30.158
Austria	T-F	T-P *	F-P *	5.416	T-F	T-P	F-P	1.551
Czech Rep.	T-F	T-P	F-P	0.997	T-F **	T-P **	F-P	5.364

Note. T = Teachers, F = Families, P = Pupils.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Table 5
Personal Repercussion Shown by the Agents in Terms of the Different Countries. Univariate ANOVA (Bonferroni). Interaction between Groups: Countries and Agents

Factors	Subscale: Level of Personal Repercussions											
	F.1a (T-F-P)				F.1b (T-F-P)				F.2 (T-F-P)			
	Difference between means	Difference between means	Difference between means	F	Difference between means	Difference between means	Difference between means	F	Difference between means	Difference between means	Difference between means	F
Spain	T-F **	T-P **	F-P **	63.473	T-F **	T-P **	F-P **	36.343	T-F **	T-P **	F-P **	60.848
Hungary	T-F	T-P	F-P	1.766	T-F **	T-P	F-P **	16.545	T-F **	T-P **	F-P **	394.355
Austria	T-F	T-P	F-P **	7.276	T-F	T-P	F-P	2.500	T-F **	T-P **	F-P	46.609
Czech Rep.	T-F	T-P	F-P	1.860	T-F **	T-P **	F-P	8.993	T-F **	T-P	F-P *	5.619

Note. T = Teachers, F = Families, P = Pupils.
 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

As can be seen in Table 6, families attain lower scores with regard to school coexistence problems than teachers and pupils, both in terms of their prevalence and of their repercussion on individuals. The difference is significant with respect to pupils and teachers in all the dimensions, except where the presence of “mild” problems is concerned (Factor 1), as it is only significant with respect to pupils (families’ score being similar to teachers’). On the other hand, as regards the highest scores in “mild” problems, it is the pupils who report the highest incidence of these (Factor

1) and, who yield a high score with reference to the personal repercussions of lack of motivation in particular (Factor 1b). The most remarkable finding amongst teachers is that whilst they do not report a high incidence of “serious” problems, they have a greater perception of their personal repercussions on individuals than pupils and their families (Factor 2).

Table 7 shows the differences of opinion between teachers, families and pupils for each item in the questionnaire. As we can see, there are significantly diverse views in the three groups on all issues except on the prevalence of fights.

Table 6
Subscales of Prevalence and Level Of Repercussions by Factor. Descriptive Statistics. Tukey’s HSD Test with Homogeneous Subsets

Subscale	Factors	Type(I)	N	M	SD	Between-Group RMS	F	p	Post hoc Tukey HSD Test		
									Difference of Means Type (J ₁) (I- J ₁)	Difference of Means Type (J ₂) (I- J ₂)	Homogeneous subsets (a = .05)
F. 1	T	T	296	1.29	0.521	18.512	61.448	.000	F	P**	T-F P
	F	F	708	1.30	0.588				T	P**	
	P	P	1708	1.54	0.537				T**	F**	
F. 2	T	T	345	0.81	0.553	5.190	11.144	.000	F**	P	F P-T
	F	F	840	0.65	0.658				T**	P**	
	P	P	1959	0.78	0.713				T	F**	
F. 1a	T	T	299	1.14	0.739	18.711	37.150	.000	F**	P	F T-P
	F	F	712	0.89	0.694				T**	P**	
	P	P	1869	1.16	0.711				T	F**	
F. 1b	T	T	303	1.30	0.696	40.179	64.983	.000	F**	P*	F T P
	F	F	730	1.02	0.782				T**	P**	
	P	P	1912	1.41	0.801				T*	F**	
F. 2	T	T	346	1.66	1.101	138.626	198.834	.000	F**	P**	F P T
	F	F	820	0.65	0.710				T**	P**	
	P	P	1946	0.76	0.829				T**	F**	

Note. T = Teachers, F = Families, P = Pupils.
 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 7

Types of Problems: Differences between Teachers, Families and Pupils. Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA

Type of problem	Type	Subscale of Prevalence of Problems					Subscale level of personal Repercussions of Problems				
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Between-Group RMS	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Between-Group RMS	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Conflicts between pupils and teachers	T	1.35	0.797	51.017	67.191	.000	1.16	0.983	38.408	40.922	.000
	F	1.11	0.866				0.71	0.873			
	P	1.54	0.885				1.07	1.000			
No clear norms of coexistence	T	1.37	0.835	14.082	9.609	.000	1.20	0.966	39.412	40.734	.000
	F	1.22	0.977				0.76	0.963			
	P	1.44	1.352				1.10	0.995			
Foul language in the classroom	T	1.32	0.807	10.155	10.812	.000	1.13	0.971	6.533	6.425	.002
	F	1.42	0.959				0.96	0.980			
	P	1.54	0.999				1.09	1.026			
Pupils insult one another	T	1.40	0.878	28.958	30.821	.000	1.17	1.009	18.700	17.213	.000
	F	1.53	0.980				1.01	1.061			
	P	1.76	0.980				1.27	1.040			
Pupils fight	T	1.56	0.772	.486	.602	.548	1.35	0.965	5.907	5.694	.003
	F	1.62	0.901				1.14	1.000			
	P	1.61	0.918				1.24	1.035			
There are groups that do not coexist amicably	T	1.45	0.797	16.136	17.928	.000	1.20	0.895	38.994	38.622	.000
	F	1.41	0.947				0.96	0.993			
	P	1.63	0.975				1.33	1.028			
There are pupils who fail to integrate and feel lonely	T	1.07	0.847	16.510	19.232	.000	1.08	1.063	11.049	10.190	.000
	F	1.17	0.944				0.86	0.965			
	P	1.35	0.933				1.04	1.068			
Teachers that are non-committal	T	0.79	0.877	20.088	22.725	.000	0.72	0.997	36.008	34.539	.000
	F	1.14	0.912				1.04	0.964			
	P	1.19	0.962				1.22	1.046			
Pupils think teachers do not understand them	T	1.35	0.813	47.825	58.347	.000	1.17	0.937	38.320	40.895	.000
	F	1.40	0.957				1.18	0.992			
	P	1.74	0.897				1.50	0.963			
Pupils' Lack of motivation/boredom	T	1.43	0.852	89.982	95.223	.000	1.95	0.845	150.324	145.094	.000
	F	1.21	1.029				0.95	1.042			
	P	1.75	0.967				1.52	1.036			
Use or presence of weapons	T	0.66	0.677	7.014	9.787	.000	1.63	1.249	183.615	178.765	.000
	F	0.49	0.787				0.41	0.811			
	P	0.64	0.896				0.75	1.043			
Use or presence of drugs	T	0.63	0.743	4.365	4.814	.008	1.54	1.183	138.403	131.151	.000
	F	0.67	0.860				0.50	0.867			
	P	0.76	1.020				0.69	1.060			
Problems of intercultural coexistence	T	1.14	0.809	12.496	14.637	.000	1.81	1.158	142.543	131.616	.000
	F	0.82	0.939				1.06	1.126			
	P	0.93	0.937				0.84	0.979			

Note. T = Teachers, F = Families, P = Pupils.

Table 8
Prevalence and Level of Personal Repercussions of Problems. Tukey HSD Test with Homogeneous Subsets

Type of problem	Prevalence		Level of repercussions		Homogeneous subsets ($\alpha = .05$)				
	Difference between agents	Difference of means	Difference between agents	Difference of means	Prevalence of Problems			Level of Repercussions	
Conflicts between pupils and teachers	T-F **	1.35-1.11	T-F **	1.16-0.71	F	T	P	F	P-T
	F-P ***	1.11-1.54	F-P ***	0.71-1.07					
	P-T **	1.54-1.35	P-T	1.07-1.16					
No clear norms of coexistence	T-F	1.37-1.22	T-F **	1.20-0.76	F	T-P	F	P-T	
	F-P ***	1.22-1.44	F-P ***	0.76-1.10					
	P-T	1.44-1.37	P-T	1.10-1.20					
Bad language in class	T-F	1.32-1.42	T-F *	1.13-0.96	T-F	P	F	P-T	
	F-P ***	1.42-1.54	F-P ***	0.96-1.09					
	P-T **	1.54-1.32	P-T	1.09-1.13					
Pupils insult one another	T-F	1.40-1.53	T-F	1.17-1.01	T	F	P	F	T-P
	F-P ***	1.53-1.76	F-P ***	1.01-1.27					
	P-T **	1.76-1.40	P-T	1.27-1.17					
Pupils fight	T-F	1.56-1.62	T-F **	1.35-1.14	T-P-F	F-P	P-T		
	F-P	1.62-1.61	F-P *	1.14-1.24					
	P-T	1.61-1.56	P-T	1.24-1.35					
There are groups that do not get on	T-F	1.45-1.41	T-F **	1.20-0.96	F-T	P	F	T-P	
	F-P ***	1.41-1.63	F-P ***	0.96-1.33					
	P-T **	1.63-1.45	P-T *	1.33-1.20					
There are pupils who fail to integrate and feel lonely	T-F	1.07-1.17	T-F **	1.08-0.86	T-F	P	F	P-T	
	F-P ***	1.17-1.35	F-P ***	0.86-1.04					
	P-T **	1.35-1.07	P-T	1.04-1.08					
Teachers just go about their own business	T-F **	0.79-1.14	T-F **	0.72-1.04	T	F-P	T	F	P
	F-P	1.14-1.19	F-P ***	1.04-1.22					
	P-T **	1.19-0.79	P-T **	1.22-0.72					
Pupils think teachers do not understand them	T-F	1.35-1.40	T-F	1.17-1.18	T-F	P	T-F	P	
	F-P ***	1.40-1.74	F-P ***	1.18-1.50					
	P-T **	1.74-1.35	P-T **	1.50-1.17					
Pupils' Lack of motivation/boredom	T-F **	1.43-1.21	T-F **	1.95-0.95	F	T	P	F	P
	F-P ***	1.21-1.75	F-P ***	0.95-1.52					
	P-T **	1.75-1.43	P-T **	1.52-1.95					
Use or presence of weapons	T-F **	0.66-0.49	T-F **	1.63-0.41	F	P-T	F	P	T
	F-P ***	0.49-0.64	F-P ***	0.41-0.75					
	P-T	0.64-0.66	P-T **	0.75-1.63					
Use or presence of drugs	T-F	0.63-0.67	T-F **	1.54-0.50	T-F	F-P	F	P	T
	F-P	0.67-0.76	F-P ***	0.50-0.69					
	P-T	0.76-0.63	P-T **	0.69-1.54					
Problems of intercultural coexistence	T-F **	1.14-0.82	T-F **	1.81-1.06	F-P	T	P	F	T
	F-P *	0.82-0.93	F-P ***	1.06-0.84					
	P-T **	0.93-1.14	P-T **	0.84-1.81					

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

We used as *post hoc* comparisons Tukey's honestly significant difference (Table 8) to show the difference of opinion between groups. In general terms, we can observe that pupils score higher than teachers and families with regard to almost all the problems, and that this is particularly so due to the following factors: conflicts between pupils and teachers; bad language in class; insults; antagonistic groups; pupils who fail to integrate and, therefore, feel lonely; pupils who think their teachers do not understand them; and lack of motivation/boredom among pupils. Teachers highlight above all problems of intercultural coexistence, while families' scores are particularly low with regard to conflicts between pupils and teachers, lack of motivation/boredom amongst pupils, use or presence of weapons and problems of intercultural coexistence.

An analysis of the levels of personal repercussions (Tables 7 and 8) reveals that it is families who feel least affected (levels being significantly lower than those of teachers and pupils in the following: conflicts between pupils and teachers; fights; antagonistic groups; children who fail to integrate and feel isolated; lack of motivation/boredom among pupils; use or presence of weapons; and use or presence of drugs). For their part, teachers feel significantly more personally affected than pupils and families by the lack of motivation/boredom among pupils and by the three problems that compose the "serious" factors (use or presence of weapons, use or presence of drugs and problems of intercultural coexistence). Finally, pupils are significantly more affected (compared to teachers and families) by the presence of rival groups, by the lack of commitment of teachers and by their perception of teachers' failure to understand them.

Conclusions

From the results obtained in the present study it emerges, first of all, that there are significant differences depending on who analyzes school problems. Thus, it is families who perceive the problems in question as least common and who feel least personally affected by them. This may be because they are unaware of the frequency and relevance of these problems due to their scarce contact with and physical presence in the schools, or because their children do not give them sufficient information about these issues. In this respect, it may be appropriate to strengthen family-school relationships for a greater involvement of parents in school problems of this nature (Cangas, Gázquez, Pérez, Padilla, & Miras, 2007; Fekkes, Pijpers, & Verloove-Vanhorick, 2005; Gázquez, Cangas, Pérez, Padilla, & Cano, 2007; Gázquez, Cangas, Pérez, & Lucas, in press). Only with regard to the presence of "mild" problems is parents' appreciation similar to that of teachers (with pupils having a greater perception of the incidence of such problems than the other two groups).

In the case of pupils, their high perception of the personal repercussions of less serious problems, especially lack of

motivation or boredom (Factor 1b) is quite remarkable. This is an aspect often overlooked when analyzing school problems, but which appears to be closely linked to academic failure and lack of commitment to the school, and may likewise have an effect on problems of school coexistence (Bennett-Johnson, 2004).

As regards teachers, they tend to be more concerned about serious coexistence problems, particularly the presence or use of weapons, the presence or use of drugs and the occurrence of intercultural problems (Table 7). In many cases, such concerns may well be partly responsible for absenteeism and the incidence of *burnout* syndrome (Evers, Tomic, & Brouwers, 2004; Hastings & Bham, 2003; Tatar & Horenczyk, 2003). Thus, although teachers and pupils appear to detect similar percentages of serious school coexistence problems, teachers are more concerned about them – an important aspect to consider with a view to intervention in order to provide schools with the necessary tools for preventing or ameliorating such problems (Orpinas, Horne, & Multisite Violence Prevention Project, 2004).

Analyzing the differences between pupils, families and teachers, in terms of countries, it can be observed that it is the Spanish and the Hungarian teachers who present the highest levels of personal repercussion; specifically for each item. We have found that both families and teachers report fights as the most prevalent problem in the schools, whilst this aspect is considered by pupils as the second most common problem, after insults (lower scores for teachers and families). Thus, the pupils' opinion coincides with those found in other studies in which indirect or verbal bullying is reported as the most frequent type of abuse in secondary schools (Defensor del Pueblo [Spanish People's Ombudsman's Report], 2007; Kepenekci & Cinkir, 2006; Kim, Koh, & Leventhal, 2004).

On the other hand, teachers and pupils coincide in perceiving pupils' lack of motivation/boredom as the problem that personally affects them most (teachers giving slightly higher scores), while families present their highest scores (greatest personal repercussion) with regard to the item "pupils think their teachers do not understand them", similar to those of teachers and significantly lower than those of pupils.

There is consensus among the three groups on perceiving as the least common problems the use or presence of weapons and the use or presence of drugs, problems that may be more closely related to certain leisure-time contexts (Díaz-Aguado, 2005), since the prevalence of these aspects is certainly high among young people (Krug, et al., 2003).

In terms of countries, we find that Hungary presents significantly lower perceived levels of both prevalence and personal repercussions of the problems analyzed, mainly on the part of pupils and families. However, Hungarian teachers report a greater incidence and more acute personal repercussions of serious problems. It would therefore appear that although the prevalence of "mild" problems is lower in Hungary, the same cannot be said of serious problems (at

least in the opinion of teachers). As for the rest of the countries analyzed, it is Czech families who, generally, report the highest incidence and effects of school coexistence problems, and pupils' reports from this country follow a similar direction (except in the case of the repercussions of serious problems, in which they score lower than families). Even so, teachers from the Czech Republic give less importance to these problems, especially in the case of "serious" ones (as regards both their presence and the personal repercussions they have). In Austria, teachers perceive a higher incidence and more significant personal repercussions of serious problems, whilst in Spain, teachers are more concerned about the personal repercussions of "mild" problems. To summarize, there are significant differences between the countries analyzed, as in the case of the study by Eslea, et al. (2003). Thus, violence can be considered as a common phenomenon across countries, but with different characteristics, possibly due to the diversity of the groups involved, cultural values, the historical and political development of each country (Kos, 2003; Neslade & Naito, 2005; Krug, et al., 2003; Sherer & Karnieli-Miller, 2004).

Nevertheless, it is necessary to compare these results with a wider sampling that is representative of the countries analyzed, for in this way, the result of this study could be proven. On equal terms, other instruments (for example, an interview) would be advisable, to analyze more accurately the differences observed and to detail their relevance.

References

- Arriaga, P., Esteves, F., Carneiro, P., & Monteiro, MB. (2006). Violent computer games and their effects on state hostility and physiological arousal. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*, 146-158.
- Bennett-Johnson, E. (2004). The root of school violence: Causes and recommendations for a plan of action. *College Student Journal, 38*, 199-202.
- Brown, S.L., Birch, D.A., & Kancherla, V. (2005). Bullying perspectives: Experiences, attitudes, and recommendations of 9- to 13-year-olds attending health education centers in the United States. *Journal of School Health, 75*, 384-392.
- Browne, K.D., & Hamilton-Giachritsis, C. (2005). The influence of violent media on children and adolescents: A public-health approach. *Lancet, 365*, 702-710.
- Cangas, A.J., Gázquez, J.J., Pérez, M.C., Padilla, D., & Miras, F. (2007). Evaluación de la violencia escolar y su afectación personal en una muestra de estudiantes europeos. *Psicothema, 19*, 114-119.
- Chapell, M., Casey, D., de la Cruz, C., Ferrel, J. et al. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. *Adolescence, 39*, 53-64.
- Defensor del Pueblo [Spanish People's Ombudsman's Report]. (2007). *Violencia escolar: el maltrato entre iguales en la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria 1999-2006*. Madrid: Publicaciones de la Oficina del Defensor del Pueblo.
- Díaz-Aguado, M.J. (2005). La violencia entre iguales en la adolescencia y su prevención desde la escuela. *Psicothema, 17*, 549-558.
- Eslea, M., & Smith, P.K. (2000). Pupil and parent attitudes towards bullying in primary schools. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 15*, 207-219.
- Eslea, M., Menesini, E., Morita, Y., O'Moore, M., Mora-Merchán, J.A., Pereira, B., & Smith, P.K. (2003). Friendship and loneliness among bullies and victims: Data from seven countries. *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 71-83.
- Evers, W., Tomic, W., & Brouwers, A. (2004). Burnout among teachers: Students' and teachers' perceptions compared. *School Psychology International, 25*, 131-148.
- Fekkes, M., Pijpers, F.I.M., & Verloove-Vanhorick, S.P. (2005). Bullying: Who does what, when and where? Involvement of children, teachers and parents in bullying behavior. *Health Education Research, 20*, 81-91.
- Fisher, K., & Kettl, P. (2003). Teachers' perceptions of school violence. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care, 17*, 79-83.
- Gázquez, J.J., Cangas, A.J., Padilla, D., Cano, A., & Pérez-Moreno, P.J. (2005). Assessment by pupils, teachers and parents of school coexistence problems in Spain, France, Austria and Hungary: Global psychometric data. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy, 5*, 101-112.
- Gázquez, J.J., Cangas, A.J., Pérez, M.C., Padilla, D., & Cano, A. (2007). Percepción de la violencia escolar por parte de los familiares: un estudio comparativo en cuatro países europeos. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 7*, 93-105.
- Gázquez, J.J., Cangas, A.J., Pérez, M.C., & Lucas, F. (in press). Teachers' perception of school violence in a sample from three European countries. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*.
- Griffin, R.S., & Gross, A.M. (2004). Childhood bullying: Current empirical findings and future directions for research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*, 379-400.
- Hastings, R.P., & Bham, M.S. (2003). The relationship between student behaviour patterns and teacher burnout. *School Psychology International, 24*, 115-128.
- Hogan, M.J. (2005). Adolescents and media violence: Six crucial issues for practitioners. *Adolescent Medicine Clinics, 16*, 249-268.
- Kepenekci, Y.K., & Cinkir, S. (2006). Bullying among Turkish high school students. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 30*, 193-204.
- Kim, S.W., & Pridemore, W.A. (2005). Poverty, socioeconomic change, institutional anomie, and homicide. *Social Science Quarterly, 86*, 1377-1398.
- Kim, Y.S., Koh, Y.J., & Leventhal, B.L. (2004). Prevalence of school bullying in Korean middle school students. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 158*, 737-741.
- Kos, A.M. (2003). Peer violence and bullying in south-east Europe. In Council of Europe, *Violence in schools: A challenge for the local community* (pp. 71-77). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Krug, E.G., Dahlberg, L.L., Mercy, J.A., Zwi, A.B., & Lozano, R. (2003). *World report on violence and health*. Ginebra: WHO.

- Meyer, H.A., Astor, R.A., & Behre, W.J. (2002). Teachers' reasoning about school violence: The role of gender and location. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 27*, 499-528.
- Muñiz, J., & Hambleton, R.K. (1996). Directrices para la traducción y adaptación de los test. *Papeles del Psicólogo, 66*, 63-70.
- Neslade, D., & Naito, M. (2005). Individualism-collectivism and the attitudes to school bullying of Japanese and Australian students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*, 37-556.
- Orpinas, P., Horne, A.M., & Multisite Violence Prevention Proyet. (2004). A teacher-focused approach to prevent and reduce students' aggressive behavior. The GREAT Teacher Program. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 26*, 29-38.
- Ortega, R., & del Rey, R. (2003). *La violencia escolar: estrategias de prevención*. Barcelona: Graó.
- Rodríguez, E. (2002). *Jóvenes y videojuegos: espacio, significación y conflictos*. Madrid: FAD-INJUVE.
- Sherer, M., & Karnieli-Miller, O. (2004). Aggression and violence among Jewish and Arab youth in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 28*, 93-109.
- Smith, P.K., Morita, Y., Junger-Tas, J., Olweus, D., Catalano, R., & Slee, P. (1999). *The nature of school bullying*. London: Routledge.
- Tatar, M., & Horenczyk, G. (2003). Diversity-related burnout among teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 397-408.

Received January 9, 2007

Revision received March 14, 2008

Accepted April 5, 2008