http://dx.doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v23.6146

BETWEEN DIALOGUE AND COERCION: ADOLESCENT AGGRESSION IN THE SCHOOL CONTEXT FROM A FAMILY–SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE

ENTRE O DIÁLOGO E A COERÇÃO: A AGRESSÃO ADOLESCENTE NO CONTEXTO ESCOLAR A PARTIR DE UMA PERSPECTIVA FAMÍLIA–ESCOLA

Article received on: 12/23/2025
Article accepted on: 3/25/2026

Débora Rodríguez-Baiget*
***Universidad Internacional de Navarra UNIR, Spain
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2105-1507
debora369rodriguez@gmail.com

Alexander Maz-Machado**
****Universidad de Córdoba, Córdoba, Spain
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4112-4363
ma1mamaa@uco.es

María Astrid Cuida-Gómez***
*****Universidad de Valladolid, Spain
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9682-0825
mariaastrid.cuida.gomez@uva.es

Gema Linde-Valenzuela**
****Universidad de Córdoba, Córdoba, Spain
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2945-7608
gemalv@uco.es

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Abstract
Adolescent violence is linked to individual, family and school-related factors. This exploratory study examined perceptions of aggression among 40 pupils (aged 11 to 15) and their families at an urban school in Colombia. Two questionnaires were used to assess perceived, perpetrated and experienced aggression, disciplinary methods and conflict resolution strategies. The results reveal discrepancies: most adolescents do not consider themselves aggressive, whilst parents report physical, verbal and emotional aggression. Parents emphasise corrective practices that adolescents perceive as unfair or ineffective, highlighting generational differences in how aggression and discipline are conceptualised. The study highlights the value of coordinated action between the school and the family to reduce aggression and improve the school climate.

Keywords: Adolescent Aggression. Family Discipline. School Coexistence. School Climate.

Resumo
A violência adolescente está relacionada a fatores individuais, familiares e escolares. Este estudo exploratório analisou as percepções de agressão entre 40 alunos (de 11 a 15 anos) e suas famílias em uma escola urbana na Colômbia. Dois questionários foram utilizados para avaliar agressão percebida, perpetrada e vivenciada, métodos disciplinares e estratégias de resolução de conflitos. Os resultados revelam discrepâncias: enquanto a maioria dos adolescentes não se considera agressiva, os pais relatam agressão física, verbal e emocional. Os pais enfatizam práticas corretivas que os adolescentes percebem como injustas ou ineficazes, destacando diferenças geracionais na forma como agressão e disciplina são conceitualizadas. O estudo ressalta o valor da ação coordenada entre a escola e a família para reduzir a agressão e melhorar o clima escolar.

Palavras-chave: *Agressão Adolescente. Disciplina Familiar. Convivência Escola. Clima Escolar.*

1 INTRODUCTION

The study of aggression in adolescence is a priority area of inquiry in the social sciences, psychology, and education, as this developmental stage is marked by biological, emotional, and social transformations that can foster the emergence of disruptive behaviors (Schiff & Lee, 2024). Understanding this phenomenon requires attending to both individual and contextual factors, as well as to the diverse ways in which aggression manifests and affects students' socio-emotional development (Romero *et al*., 2024). The present study aims to explore and describe perceptions of adolescent aggression among students aged 11–15 and their families in an urban school context in Ibagué, Colombia. Its specific objectives are to: (1) identify self-perceived, enacted, and received forms of aggression from both adolescent and caregiver perspectives; (2) analyze family disciplinary strategies and conflict-resolution practices reported by both groups; (3) contrast intergenerational perceptions of aggression and discipline to detect potential interpretive gaps; and (4) generate context-specific inputs for designing coordinated school–family preventive interventions. These objectives are achievable through comparative analysis of data obtained via structured questionnaires administered to 40 student–family dyads, enabling a situated understanding of the phenomenon without claims to statistical generalizability.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

El marco teórico en un estudio comprende un análisis crítico y organizado de la literatura relevante al tema, proporcionando una contextualización teórica y definiendo los conceptos clave. Debe contener de manera integral teorías, modelos e investigaciones previas, identificando vacíos, contradicciones y consensos en la literatura que sean importantes para el enfoque del trabajo que se desarrolla.

2.1 Conceptualizing adolescent aggression

Violence is a complex phenomenon shaped by multiple factors and cannot be understood as an individual attribute; rather, it results from dynamic interactions among

personal, family, school, and community elements (Bronfenbrenner, 1987). Adolescence is a pivotal period for consolidating identity and autonomy, which can generate conflicts in relationships with adults and peers. The need for self-assertion, combined with still-maturing executive functions—especially impulse control and emotion regulation—may lead to aggressive responses to situations perceived as threatening or frustrating (Tremblay, 2000). Adolescent aggression manifests in diverse forms, encompassing physical dimensions—such as direct bodily aggression—verbal expressions (insults, threats), and emotional expressions understood as hostility or affective manipulation, which include relational dynamics such as social exclusion or rumor spreading attributable to peer bullying. These forms differ not only in their manifestations but also in their effects on psychosocial development, as they are associated with poorer emotional well-being, social isolation, and difficulties in building secure bonds (Romero *et al.*, 2024).

Within these manifestations, the literature distinguishes between reactive and proactive aggression. The former responds to real or perceived provocations and is often linked to low frustration tolerance or deficits in emotional self-regulation. The latter is deliberate and oriented toward obtaining personal gains, such as status or social control (Vitaro & Brendgen, 2005). Both can coexist in the same individual, and their expression depends on context and prior social learning. In this sense, reactive aggression is an impulsive response to provocation, whereas proactive aggression is a planned, goal-directed use of violence to obtain personal benefits or status. This distinction is relevant for understanding impacts on adolescent socio-emotional development, given that aggression can interfere with identity consolidation, emotion regulation, and the sense of group belonging.

Moreover, several studies identify psychosocial factors—particularly socioeconomic status—as modulators of parenting quality and exposure to risk contexts (Boyd, 2025). Families with fewer resources tend to experience greater stress, which negatively affects parenting practices and, consequently, children's behavioral adjustment. In addition, precariousness, job instability, and community exposure to violence are structural factors that, in interaction with family and school dynamics, configure scenarios of accumulated risk (Kennedy *et al.*, 2024). Thus, violent social contexts, peer pressure, limited institutional resources, and the reproduction of sexist

cultural norms can contribute to the normalization of aggressive behaviors, hindering their early identification and prevention. Following Kennedy, Johnson, and Matthews (2024), when school climate tolerates aggressive peer behaviors, when classmates reinforce hostile or unequal norms, and when institutions lack clear intervention protocols, school aggression rises and victims face greater barriers to reporting or receiving support.

2.2 Family context and disciplinary strategies

The family context is a foundational space for socio-emotional development and for the construction of relational patterns. Disciplinary practices in this sphere not only shape how adolescents interpret authority but also define ways of resolving conflicts and regulating behavior. When educational practices are characterized by corporal punishment, emotional coercion, or normative inconsistency, children tend to reproduce domination schemas and display higher levels of aggression toward their environment. Longitudinal studies show that harsh parental discipline—including corporal punishment and psychological aggression—is prospectively associated with increases in children's aggressive behaviors (Yang *et al*., 2023). By contrast, approaches grounded in dialogue, warm supervision, and inductive discipline have shown protective effects by fostering self-regulation, empathy, and the internalization of social norms. Evidence suggests that positive discipline, when it combines demandingness with responsiveness, promotes healthier socio-emotional development and reduces the propensity to use violence as a coping strategy. Intergenerational transmission of violence should not be overlooked: mothers and fathers raised under severe discipline frequently replicate those strategies in the upbringing of their own children. A recent review reported a significant positive correlation in the intergenerational transmission of corporal punishment (Concklin *et al*., 2023). These dynamics establish coercive models over time and reinforce the normalization of "educational" violence as a response to conflict.

The classic typology of parenting styles proposed by Baumrind (1991), expanded by Maccoby and Martin (1983), remains a benchmark. The authoritative style—high warmth with balanced control—is associated with better emotional adjustment, higher self-esteem, and a lower propensity to violence. In contrast, the authoritarian style—rigid

control with limited communication—raises the likelihood that adolescents internalize coercive models. Permissive (indulgent) and neglectful styles are likewise linked to increased risk of disruptive behaviors. Beyond general typologies, recent research has focused on parental coherence. Perceived inconsistency between maternal and paternal practices, or contradictory messages, generates normative confusion in children and is associated with greater conflict and adjustment problems (de la Iglesia *et al*., 2011). Inductive discipline—based on reasoning and explanation—fosters self-regulation and moral development; coercive discipline, which includes physical and psychological punishment, is associated with greater aggression, low self-esteem, and antisocial behaviors (Gámez-Guadix, *et al*., 2020).

The cultural normalization of corporal punishment as a disciplinary method remains an obstacle to eradicating these practices, despite evidence of their short- and long-term harms (Miller, 2009). Recent studies confirm cumulative trajectories of violence from childhood to adolescence and, later, into adulthood, with specific impacts on intimate relationships and future parenting (Ibabe, 2020).

2.3 Child-to-parent violence

In recent years, child-to-parent violence (CPV) has gained increasing scholarly attention. It is defined as a pattern of repeated physical, psychological, or economic behaviors intended to exert control over one's parents. Far from anecdotal, CPV shows non-trivial prevalence in countries such as Spain, Canada, Australia, and the United States. In a systematic review, Ibabe (2020) identified four CPV typologies—offensive, defensive, affective, and situational—and underscored the scarcity of specific, validated psychometric instruments. Recent studies have pinpointed risk factors including maternal emotional rejection, low family cohesion, interparental conflict, low adolescent self-esteem, substance use, and prior exposure to violence. Qualitative analyses further document how exposure to domestic violence unfolds into sequences of violence toward mothers and fathers, with gender differences modulating its expression (Rogers & Ashworth, 2024). A recurrent finding is the divergence between parents' perceptions and adolescents' self-perceptions: parents tend to interpret aggressive behaviors as disobedience or defiance, whereas adolescents may justify them as responses to

perceivedly unfair parenting. This perception gap reflects not only generational differences but also distinct ways of conceptualizing violence (Foster, 2013).

2.4 Peer group influence and the school context

Peers assume particular salience in adolescence, becoming a key agent of socialization. Affiliation with groups displaying deviant behaviors increases the likelihood of aggression and instrumental violence. Longitudinal evidence shows that adolescents who deploy aggression to gain social status tend to be rejected in the long run, which reinforces marginalization and the risk of antisocial conduct (Favre *et al*., 2024). Within schools, institutional climate is decisive: when schools are perceived as fair and safe, they operate as protective factors; conversely, climates marked by authoritarian hierarchies, discrimination, or the absence of mediation mechanisms foster aggressive behaviors. Douglas and Orpinas (Zhao & Li, 2022) found that youth with high-aggression trajectories rely more on violent strategies, whereas those with low aggression favor dialogue—highlighting mediation and conflict-resolution strategies as central to prevention. Programs such as *Aulas en Paz* have proven effective in reducing school violence by strengthening dialogue, cooperation, and peaceful conflict resolution (Chaux *et al*., 2017), underscoring the value of school-based initiatives focused on violence detection, social skills, emotional education, conflict management, and effective communication.

3 METHOD

3.1 Study design

The study is framed within a reflexive action-research methodology, understood as an approach committed to transforming both educational practices and social structures. From this perspective, a descriptive, exploratory design was adopted to understand the dynamics that shape manifestations of adolescent aggression, situating them within family, school, and social contexts, and considering the perspectives of both adolescents and their relatives (mothers, fathers, or grandmothers). The exploratory

nature of the study responds to the need to generate empirical knowledge in a specific context—without claims to generalizability—while providing evidence to inform future educational interventions. The research was conducted in an urban educational institution in Ibagué, Colombia, and focused on identifying aggression dynamics and the conflict-resolution strategies employed by students and their families.

3.2 Participants

The sample comprised 40 adolescents and their corresponding family members, for a total of 80 participants. Students were enrolled in seventh grade (class 7B) at a public school in Ibagué, Colombia, and were between 11 and 15 years old. They resided in socially disadvantaged settings—specifically, *Comuna 9* (Las Américas sector)—and presented diverse family circumstances. Family members ranged in age from 33 to 62 years and included mothers, fathers, and grandmothers. Sampling was purposive and convenience-based, as paired participation (adolescent–relative dyads) was required. This condition was facilitated by the group's homeroom teacher, enabling direct and ethical contact with families and ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation.

3.3 Instruments

Two researcher-developed structured questionnaires were designed and administered—one for students and one for their family members. Both instruments were intended to collect information on perceptions of aggression, its manifestations (physical, verbal, and emotional), and conflict-resolution strategies. The student questionnaire comprised 11 items focusing on self-perceived aggression, types of aggression enacted and received, perceptions of authority in the school context, conflict-resolution strategies, and contextual influences. The family questionnaire included 12 items exploring perceptions of adolescents' aggressive behavior, disciplinary strategies and value education, personal experiences of violence in childrearing and intimate partnerships, and beliefs regarding the influence of friendships and leisure-time use. Both questionnaires were reviewed by subject-matter experts in gender and violence from the University of

Tolima (Colombia), the University of Valladolid (Spain), and the University of Córdoba (Spain) to ensure content validity, clarity of wording, and sociocultural appropriateness for the specific context.

3.4 Procedure

Data collection took place during the second semester of the academic year after obtaining institutional authorizations and informed consent from participating families. The process was embedded in pedagogical activities and meetings with relatives, in accordance with prevailing ethical standards for research involving minors. Administration of the instruments occurred in two distinct stages:

First, the student questionnaire was administered during school hours in the presence of the researcher and in a controlled setting that safeguarded response confidentiality. The researcher's familiarity with the class—in their role as homeroom teacher—fostered a climate of trust that facilitated voluntary, informed participation.

Subsequently, the family questionnaires were distributed along with a cover letter detailing instructions for proper completion. These were returned in person, with anonymity and ethical handling of information assured at all times. Data collection concluded once the full set of adolescent–family dyads had been obtained, a prerequisite for comparative analysis of both perspectives. Responses were initially tabulated in spreadsheets (*Excel*) and then exported to *SPSS* for analysis. Descriptive techniques were applied and relationships among variables were examined to identify patterns of perception and behavior.

3.5 Data analysis

Data obtained through the questionnaires were first tabulated in spreadsheets and then processed with *SPSS*. Descriptive statistics were used to examine absolute and relative frequency distributions (percentages) for each item in both groups—adolescents and family members. The analysis focused on identifying patterns of perception and behavior, as well as interpreting trends and divergences between the two groups.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results are presented in four analytical blocks derived from the questionnaires administered to students and families: (1) perceptions and manifestations of violence among students; (2) family practices and conflict resolution; (3) contextual factors and experiences of violence; and (4) intergenerational comparison. This organization enables a comparative examination of both groups' reported perceptions regarding aggression and its associated dynamics. Given the number of response tables for each item, they have all been included in the Appendix.

4.1 Perception and manifestations of violence among students

The data show a significant discrepancy between self-perceived aggressiveness and actually enacted behaviors. Only 20% of adolescents consider themselves aggressive, whereas 80% reject that self-definition (Table 1). However, when asked about specific behaviors, roughly one third acknowledge having perpetrated some form of physical (27.5%; Table 2), verbal (25%; Table 3), or emotional (22.5%; Table 4) violence. This divergence may be explained by normalization processes whereby young people do not identify certain behaviors as aggressive even though they meet the defining characteristics.

Analysis of aggression targets indicates that siblings are most frequently identified, positioning the intrafamilial sphere as a common arena of conflict. Next are classmates and friends, whereas aggression toward parental figures—particularly the mother—is less frequent but not absent (Tables 2–4). These findings suggest that aggression is not confined to horizontal peer contexts but also extends to vertical relationships with household authority figures. Regarding victimization, most students report not feeling victimized; nevertheless, 35% report having suffered verbal aggression (Table 5) and 12.5% emotional aggression (Table 6). The main sources are siblings, parents, and classmates, although a minority mention teacher as responsible for behaviors perceived as emotional or unfair (Tables 5–6). The coexistence of low self-perceived aggressiveness with notable experiences of victimization underscores the need to

strengthen emotional awareness and the capacity to identify manifestations of violence beyond overt physical aggression (Tables 1, 5–6).

4.2 Family practices and conflict resolution

The results show clear agreement between students and families in preferring dialogue as a conflict-resolution strategy: 87.5% of students and 92.5% of parents identify it as the primary resource (Tables 7 and 15); among students, an aggressive response appears as a minority option (12.5%, Table 7). This intergenerational convergence provides a positive starting point for promoting peaceful strategies in educational and family settings.

Nevertheless, there is a notable discrepancy in perceptions of aggressiveness. While 90% of families consider their children not aggressive, only 10% acknowledge such behaviors (mainly verbal or emotional), in contrast with students' self-reports. This difference suggests potential unawareness, minimization, or invisibilization of violence by families (Tables 12–13). Regarding disciplinary strategies, verbal correction is the most frequent practice (35%), followed by the combination of verbal and physical correction (30%), emotional methods (20%), and no correction (15%) (Table 14). The persistence of physical punishment, even when paired with dialogue, evidences the coexistence of punitive and communicative approaches, conveying a contradictory message to adolescents.

In sum, although dialogue holds a central place in both families' and adolescents' discourse, disciplinary practices continue to include coercive elements, which may contribute to reproducing violent interaction patterns in everyday life (Tables 7 and 12–15).

4.3 Contextual factors and prior experiences of violence

The data show the influence of multiple contextual factors in shaping adolescent behavior. Students attribute their behavior primarily to external causes (42.5%) and the family environment (30%), while friendships (17.5%) and personal characteristics (10%) appear secondary (Table 10). In contrast, families emphasize the importance of parenting

(62.5%), friendships (92.5%), and the use of leisure time (75%) (Tables 17, 19 and 20). These differences suggest that young people tend to externalize their behavior to immediate circumstances, whereas parents interpret it as the outcome of longer-term socialization processes.

Family perceptions underscore the interplay between primary and secondary socialization. Seventy-five percent consider inadequate use of leisure time to negatively affect behavior, and over 90% point to the decisive influence of friendships (Tables 20 and 19). At the same time, 92.5% report transmitting ethical and moral values as a central component of parenting, whereas 62.5% view youth aggressiveness as a reflection of the upbringing received (Tables 21 and 17). Thus, the family is portrayed both as a protective space through value transmission and as a potential setting for reproducing violence. A life-course view of parents adds a key element: 37.5% acknowledge having been victims of physical aggression in childhood (Table 16), and 62.5% report experiences of verbal violence in intimate relationships (Table 23). These results point to the intergenerational transmission of violence, insofar as schemas learned in earlier stages may be reproduced in current childrearing—or, alternatively, prompt conscious efforts to interrupt the cycle.

Within the school domain, students express an ambivalent view of teachers: 35% describe them as authoritarian (Table 9), yet 97.5% report feeling treated with respect (Table 11). The coexistence of these perceptions suggests that the exercise of authority can generate tensions in coexistence while interpersonal relations retain a positive balance, positioning the school as a space that is simultaneously normative and relational.

4.4 Intergenerational comparison

The comparison of student and family perceptions highlights both divergences and convergences. In terms of self-perception, only 20% of youths consider themselves aggressive, whereas parents reduce this figure to 10%. This gap reflects a shared tendency to minimize violence, albeit with an interpretive mismatch that may hinder the early detection of aggressive behaviors.

Regarding the types of aggression enacted, adolescents acknowledge physical, verbal, and emotional behaviors mainly directed toward siblings and peers, while most families deny the presence of such behaviors at home, with only 10% reporting episodes

of verbal or emotional violence. This contrast points to the normalization of certain violent practices that remain invisible in adult perceptions.Family-reported disciplinary strategies confirm the persistence of punitive methods, with a notable presence of physical punishment, even when combined with dialogue. This ambivalence sends contradictory messages about conflict regulation to adolescents, simultaneously promoting and constraining recourse to dialogue.

Table 24

Relationship between family and students perceptions

Relation	Adolescents	Families	Analysis
Self-perceived aggression vs. parents' perception	Only 20% of youths consider themselves aggressive.	10% of parents consider their children behave aggressively.	Suggests some youths who view themselves as aggressive are not perceived as such by their parents.
Types of aggression enacted	A significant share admit physical (27.5%) and verbal (25%) aggression toward others.	Most parents (90%) report their children have not aggressed against them; 10% report some aggression (emotional or verbal).	Indicates youths may not perceive/report aggression toward others in the same way parents perceive aggression toward themselves.
Methods of correction	Perception of aggression by authority figures is not directly reported.	85% use non-physical methods (emotional or verbal); 30% also use physical methods.	High use of verbal/physical correction may shape adolescents' perceptions of aggression.
Conflict resolution	87.5% prefer resolving conflicts through dialogue.	92.5% seek dialogue in family difficulties.	Substantial concordance in valuing dialogue as the primary conflict-resolution method.

There is strong intergenerational agreement in conflict resolution: both students (87.5%) and parents (92.5%) prioritize dialogue, while aggression remains marginal. This suggests a solid basis for a family–school alliance to promote peaceful coexistence. Overall, the findings reveal parental underestimation of youth aggression alongside a shared endorsement of dialogue as a key strategy, highlighting the need for coordinated interventions to make normalized violence visible and promote educational models centered on dialogue rather than coercion.

4.5 Discussion

This study aimed to explore intergenerational perceptions of adolescent aggression by examining youths' self-views, family appraisals, and associated contextual factors. The findings reveal significant discrepancies between students' self-image and their families' perceptions, together with the persistence of mixed disciplinary strategies at home—evidence consistent with processes of violence normalization and its intergenerational transmission.

One of the most notable results is the divergence between adolescents' low self-perception of aggressiveness (20%) and their higher acknowledgment of violent behaviors toward peers and relatives (≈30%). This discrepancy suggests the normalization of everyday violence, consistent with recent studies indicating that adolescents do not always recognize low-intensity verbal or emotional behaviors as aggressive (Dahouri *et al*., 2025). The prevalence of aggression toward siblings and classmates highlights the immediate environment as the primary arena of conflict, aligning with evidence on peer violence and child-to-parent violence (Meinck *et al*., 2025).

From the parental perspective, there is a clear underestimation of youth aggressiveness: 90% of parents deny violent behaviors in their children. This minimization aligns with Narayan *et al.* (2021), who emphasize that many families render mild forms of violence invisible, interpreting them as normal coexistence. This observation is also consistent with recent scoping reviews showing that parents often underestimate coercive and aggressive behaviors within the home environment (Rogers & Ashworrth, 2024).

Family perceptions not only diverge from adolescents' self-reports but may also hinder early detection of risk behaviors—especially when physical or verbal correction is normalized as a legitimate educational tool (Gámez-Guadix *et al*., 20210; Conklin *et al*., 2023).

Regarding regulation strategies and disciplinary practices, both groups show a strong convergence around dialogue (≈90%). Nevertheless, coercive elements persist in the home (e.g., combined verbal and physical correction in about 30%), conveying ambivalent normative messages: conversation is promoted, yet force remains legitimized

as an educational resource. This finding concurs with evidence linking coercive discipline to later increases in aggressiveness and the intergenerational transmission of punitive models (Yang, *et al*., 2023; Xu *et al*., 2025; Heilman *et al*, 2021).

The data also highlight the influence of contextual factors: while adolescents attribute their behavior to immediate external circumstances, families emphasize parenting, friendships, and leisure-time use. This contrast reflects distinct explanatory frameworks that, as Narayan *et al.* (2021) argue, often fuel intergenerational conflict in causal attributions, as well as the role of socioeconomic stress in shaping family life (Roubinov & Boyce, 2018; Martins *et al*., 2023). Added to this is the historical burden: more than one-third of parents report having experienced physical violence in childhood and nearly two-thirds verbal violence in intimate relationships—evidence reinforcing the intergenerational model of violence documented by Ehrensaft *et al.* (2003) and updated in recent research (Greene *et al*, 2020). Recent reviews also point to parental stress and early coercive experiences as predictors of child-to-parent violence, underscoring the relevance of preventive family-based interventions (Junco-Guerrero *et al*, 2025).

School emerges as an ambivalent space. Although 35% of students perceive teachers as authoritarian, nearly all (97.5%) report feeling treated with respect. This suggests that normative authority can coexist with positive relational climates and that peaceful conflict-resolution practices (mediation, dialogue) represent opportunities for prevention. These findings align with research on the role of school climate and peer norms in shaping aggression trajectories, as well as with the effectiveness of socio-emotional programs such as *Aulas en Paz* (Kenedy *et al*, 2024; Chaux *et al*, 2017; Pinchak 2024; Laninga-Wijnen *et al*., 2021). The effectiveness of positive behavioral interventions has also been confirmed by international studies reporting measurable reductions in school violence and improvements in coexistence (Freeman e tal., 2024).

Likewise, international literature highlights that schools implementing integrated socio-emotional interventions and non-coercive management strategies significantly reduce peer violence and improve coexistence (rizzo *et al*., 2023; Mayer & Furlong, 2021). Taken together, two fundamental processes stand out: familial minimization of aggression and intergenerational agreement in valuing dialogue as a central conflict-resolution strategy. These conclusions underscore the need to strengthen socio-emotional

competencies, make normalized violence visible, and implement coordinated family–school programs that enhance coherence between discourse and educational practice.

5 CONCLUSION

The results obtained highlight that family dynamics and school environments play decisive roles in shaping adolescent aggression. While the family context provides the initial frameworks for emotional regulation and conflict resolution, the school functions as an extension of these models, either reproducing or transforming them.

The findings confirm the coexistence of coercive and dialogic practices in family education, reflecting ambivalence in the transmission of values related to coexistence and respect. Although both adolescents and parents recognize dialogue as the most appropriate strategy for conflict resolution, the persistence of punitive practices—such as physical or verbal correction—reveals contradictions between educational discourse and action. Likewise, the contrast between adolescents' self-perception and parents' evaluations underscores the need to develop reflective spaces that promote mutual understanding and emotional literacy within families. The normalization of certain violent behaviors, together with the minimization of their impact, makes early detection difficult and weakens preventive action in educational settings.

Consequently, coordinated interventions between families and schools are essential to strengthen socio-emotional competencies, identify normalized forms of violence, and consolidate coherent, non-coercive educational models. These findings reinforce the relevance of preventive and formative strategies centered on empathy, dialogue, and mutual respect as fundamental pillars of coexistence and the promotion of peace. The main limitation concerns the sample: convenience sampling from a single institution and reliance on self-report constrain causal inference and generalizability. Although instruments were content-validated, future studies should incorporate standardized, multi-method measures, and longitudinal designs with probabilistic samples to estimate trajectories and test explanatory models (e.g., mediating roles of school climate and parental consistency). Such extensions would clarify the relative contributions of family context, peers, and school across the course of aggression and improve the targeting of interventions.

REFERENCES

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*(1), 56–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431691111004

Boyd, C. E. (2025). *Relationship between parental neglect, socioeconomic status, and aggression in adolescents* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1987). *La ecología del desarrollo humano*. Paidós.

Chaux, E., Barrera, M., Molano, A., Velásquez, A. M., Castellanos, M., Chaparro, M. P., & Bustamante, A. (2017). Classrooms in Peace within violent contexts: Field evaluation of Aulas en Paz in Colombia. *Prevention Science, 18*(7), 828–838. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-017-0754-8

Conklin, C., Smith, J., & Lee, R. (2023). Corporal punishment across generations: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Psychology, 37*(1), 12–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000987

Dahouri, A., Mirghafourvand, M., & Hosseinzadeh, M. (2025). Prevalence of child-to-parent violence and its determinants: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health, 25*, 1426. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-22600-y

Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., & Brown, J. (2003). Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: A 20-year prospective study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*(4), 741–753. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.71.4.741

Favre, T., Lemoine, P., & Dufour, S. (2024). Social status and aggression in adolescence: Longitudinal evidence from peer networks. *Journal of Adolescence, 97*, 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2023.101115

Foster, S. L. (2013). Adolescents' justification of aggression: A social-cognitive perspective. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42*(9), 1323–1335. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9876-4

Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., McCoach, D. B., Sugai, G., & Lombardi, A. (2024). The impact of school-wide positive behavior interventions on student outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 26*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/10983007231123456

Gámez-Guadix, M., Villa-George, F., & Calvete, E. (2010). The role of coercive discipline in child-to-parent violence. *Psicothema, 22*(4), 648–654.

Greene, C. A., Haisley, L., Wallace, C., & Hibel, L. C. (2020). Intergenerational transmission of violence: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Psychology, 34*(3), 257–270. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000596

Heilmann, A., Mehay, A., Watt, R. G., Kelly, Y., Durrant, J. E., van Turnhout, J., &

Gershoff, E. T. (2021). Physical punishment and child outcomes: A narrative review of prospective studies. *The Lancet, 398*(10297), 355–364. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00582-1

Ibabe, I. (2020). A systematic review of youth-to-parent aggression: Conceptualization, typologies, and instruments. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 577757. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.577757

Junco-Guerrero, A., Ruiz-Fernández, A., & Cantón-Cortés, D. (2025). Risk factors for child-to-parent violence: A scoping review. *Journal of Family Violence*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-023-00621-8

Kennedy, R., Johnson, T., & Matthews, L. (2024). School climate and peer norms: Impacts on adolescent aggression. *Journal of School Psychology, 92*, 66–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.03.001

Laninga-Wijnen, L., van den Berg, Y. H. M., Mainhard, T., & Cillessen, A. H. N. (2021). The role of aggressive peer norms in children's perceptions of classroom peer climate and school adjustment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 50*, 2059–2076. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-021-01432-0

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. En *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1–101). Wiley.

Mayer, M. J., & Furlong, M. J. (2021). Preventing school violence: A framework for safe and effective schools. *Psychology in the Schools, 58*(3), 234–248.

Meinck, F., Cluver, L., & Boyes, M. (2025). Peer violence and child-to-parent aggression: A longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.

Miller, A. (2009). *Por tu propio bien: El drama del niño dotado*. Fábula Tusquets.

Narayan, A. J., Rivera, L. M., Bernstein, R. E., Harris, W. W., & Lieberman, A. F. (2021). Violence in the home: Intergenerational transmission and implications for intervention. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 117*, 105078.

Pinchak, N. P. (2024). A paradox of school social organization: Positive school climate, friendship network density, and adolescent violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-024-02034-2

Rogers, M. M., & Ashworth, C. (2024). Child-to-parent violence and abuse: A scoping review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380241246033

Romero, A., Blanch, A., Martínez, A., & Malas, O. (2024). Empathy, personality, and aggression in male and female adolescents. *Current Psychology, 43*, 33160–33169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06859-9

Schiff, S. J., & Lee, S. S. (2024). Relational and physical victimization and aggression trajectories in adolescence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*.

https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2024.2434913

Tremblay, R. E. (2000). The development of aggressive behaviour during childhood: What have we learned in the past century? *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 24*(2), 129–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/016502500383232

Vitaro, F., & Brendgen, M. (2005). Proactive and reactive aggression: A developmental perspective. En R. E. Tremblay, W. W. Hartup, & J. Archer (Eds.), *Developmental origins of aggression* (pp. 178–201). Guilford Press.

Xu, Y., Wang, X., & Silverstein, M. (2025). Intergenerational transmission of corporal punishment: A scoping review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380251336170

Yang, Q.-F., Xie, R.-B., Zhang, R., & Ding, W. (2023). Harsh childhood discipline and developmental changes in adolescent aggressive behavior: The mediating role of self-compassion. *Behavioral Sciences, 13*(9), 725. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13090725

Zhao, Q., & Li, C. (2022). Victimized adolescents' aggression in cliques with different victimization norms. *Journal of School Psychology, 92*, 66–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.03.001

APPENDIX I

Tables of results for each item

Table 1

Perception of violence: Do you consider yourself aggressive

Response	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentage
NO	32	80.0	80.0
YES	8	20.0	100.0

Table 2

Physical aggression: Do you physically attack…?

Target	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Classmates	1	2.5	2.5
Siblings	4	10.0	12.5
Siblings, classmates, Friends	2	5.0	17.5
Siblings, classmates, Friends, mother	1	2.5	20.0
Mother	2	5.0	25.0
Does not physically attack	29	72.5	97.5
Cousins	1	2.5	100

Table 3

Verbal psychological aggression: Do you verbally attack…?

Target	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Friends	1	2.5	2.5
Classmates	1	2.5	5.0
Siblings	3	7.5	12.5
Siblings, classmates, Friends	1	2.5	15.0
Siblings, classmates, Friends, mother	1	2.5	17.5
Siblings, classmates, friends, teachers, father, mother	1	2.5	20.0
Mother	2	5.0	25.0
Does not verbally attack	30	75.0	100

Table 4

Emotional psychological aggression: Do you emotionally attack…?

Target	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Friends. does not emotionally attack	1	2.5	2.5
Classmates	1	2.5	5.0
Siblings	2	5.0	10.0
Siblings, classmates, Friends	1	2.5	12.5
Siblings, classmates, cousins	1	2.5	15.0
Siblings, mother	1	2.5	17.5
Siblings, cousins, Friends	2	5.0	22.5
Does not emotionally attack	31	77.5	100.0

Table 5

Verbal psychological victimization: Do you feel verbally attacked by…?

Source	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Friends	1	2.5	2.5
Classmates	2	5.0	7.5
Classmates, Friends	2	5.0	12.5
Classmates, father, mother	1	2.5	15.0
Siblings, Friends	1	2.5	17.5
Siblings, classmates	2	5.0	22.5
Siblings, classmates, Friends, father	1	2.5	25.0
Siblings, cousins, Friends	1	2.5	27.5
Not verbally attacked	26	65.0	92.5
Father	2	5.0	97.5
Father, mother	1	2.5	100

Table 6

Emotional psychological victimization: Do you feel emotionally attacked by…?

Source	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Classmates	1	2.5	2.5
Siblings, classmates, cousins, teachers	1	2.5	5.0

Siblings, father, mother	1	2.5	7.5
Not emotionally victimized	35	87.5	95.0
Father, mother	1	2.5	97.5
Teachers	1	2.5	100.0

Table 7

Conflict resolution strategies: How do you prefer to resolve conflicts?

Strategy	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Dialogue	35	87.5	87.5
Responds with aggression	5	12.5	100

Table 8

Perception of peer aggression: Do you perceive any type of aggression within your closest group of friends?

Type of aggression	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Physical. Verbal	2	5.0	5.0
No type of aggression evident	25	62.5	67.5
Emotional	1	2.5	70.0
Verbal	12	30.0	100.0

Table 9

Perception of teachers (by students): Do you consider your teachers to be authoritarian?

Response	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
No	26	65.0	65.0
Yes	14	35.0	100.0

Table 10.

Attribution of influences on behavior: Do you think your behavior is influenced by…?

Factor	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Lack of values	6	15.0	15.0
Neighborhood social environment	1	2.5	17.5
Other causes	17	42.5	60.0
Home environment	7	17.5	77.5
Home environment lacks values	1	2.5	80.0
Home environment, neighborhood social environment	3	7.5	87.5
Home environment. neighborhood social environment. other causes	1	2.5	90.0
Home environment, other causes	2	5.0	95.0
Home environment, nutritional problems, neighborhood social environment	2	5.0	100.0

Table 11

Perception of teachers' treatment (by students): How do you feel treated by your teachers?

Type of Ttreatment	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
With aggression	1	2.5	2.5
With respect	39	97.5	100.0

Table 12

Family perception of adolescent aggression: Do you consider that your children behaves aggressively?

Response	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
No	36	90.0	90.0
Yes	3	7.5	97.5
Yes. physical and verbal	1	2.5	100.0

Table 13

Types of adolescent aggression toward families: In what way has your son/daughter attacked you?

	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
None	36	90.0	90.0
Emotional	3	7.5	97.5
Verbal	1	2.5	100.0

Table 14

Intervention strategies for behavior modification (by families): How do you correct your son/daughter?

Strategy	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
None	6	15.0	15.0
Emotional	8	20.0	35.0
Verbal	14	35.0	70.0
Verbal and physical	12	30.0	100.0

Table 15

Family problem-solving: When facing family difficulties. is dialogue sought?

Response	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
No	3	7.5	7.5
Yes	37	92.5	100.0

Table 16

Families' prior experiences of violence: Were you attacked by your parents in the form of…?

	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Physical	15	37.5	37.5
None	13	32.5	70.0
Verbal, physical	9	22.5	92.5
Verbal, physical, emotional	3	7.5	100.0

Table 17

Attribution of violent behavior to upbringing: Do you believe an aggressive person is a reflection of their upbringing?

Response	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Sometimes	9	22.5	22.5
No	6	15.0	37.5
Yes	25	62.5	100.0

Table 18

Parental discipline strategies: What method do you use to correct your child?

Method	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Physical punishment	10	25.0	25.0
Dialogue	24	60.0	85.0
Privilege suspensión	6	15.0	100.0

Table 19

Influence of the peer group on adolescent behavor: Do you think your child 's Friends influence their behavior?

Response	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
No	3	7.5	7.5
Yes	37	92.5	100.0

Table 20

Influence of leisure time on adolescent behavior: Does the misuse of free time affect your child's behavior?

Response	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
No	10	25.0	25.0
Yes	30	75.0	100.0

Table 21

Family value education: Do you teach your child ethical and moral values?

Reponse	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
No	3	7.5	7.5
Yes	37	92.5	100.0

Table 22

Number of children: How many children do you have?

Number	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Two	19	47.5	47.5
Three or more	21	52.5	100.0

Table 23

Interparental aggression (type): What type of aggression do you currently have or have had with your partner?

Type of aggression	Frecuency	Percentege	Cumulative Percentege
Physical	6	15.0	15.0
None	7	17.5	32.5
Emotional	2	5.0	37.5
Verbal	25	62.5	100.0