

Felip Jacas, N., Puiggalí Apelluz, J. & Tesouro Cid, M. (2024). Análisis de dificultades de convivencia en centros escolares de Cataluña. Propuestas de mejora. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 27(1), 225-239.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6018/reifop.577881>

## Análisis de dificultades de convivencia en centros escolares de Cataluña. Propuestas de mejora

Nuri Felip Jacas, Joan Puiggalí Apelluz, Montserrat Tesouro Cid

Universitat de Girona

### Resumen

En el presente trabajo se pretende analizar los principales conflictos, que tienen lugar en las escuelas de educación infantil y primaria de Cataluña (de 3 a 12 años), y los mecanismos de resolución y de prevención que se proponen desde los centros educativos.

Se aplicó un cuestionario electrónico de 30 preguntas a equipos directivos de Cataluña y se obtuvieron 481 respuestas.

Los resultados muestran un índice de conflictividad bajo, con conflictos leves que se achacan a causas externas, especialmente destacando las incoherencias entre los valores que se transmiten en la escuela y en la sociedad. También indican que las propuestas de mejora de la convivencia son de diversa índole (del ámbito curricular, organizativo, profesional y comunitario) y que, para el éxito de estas, son básicas la participación de los docentes, la motivación, la concienciación y el liderazgo del equipo directivo.

Finalmente se ha constatado la necesidad de continuar estudiando aspectos que se han manifestado de interés: la importancia del liderazgo, la necesidad de compartir las experiencias escolares valiosas y el valor de la formación inicial de los docentes para afrontar la conflictividad escolar.

### Palabras clave

Educación primaria; violencia escolar; resolución de conflictos; medidas de prevención.

---

### Contacto:

Nuri Felip Jacas [nuria.felip@udg.edu](mailto:nuria.felip@udg.edu) Universitat de Girona.

## An analysis of problems of coexistence in schools in Catalunya. Suggestions for improvements.

### Abstract

This article aims to analyse the main conflicts that occur in infant and primary schools (from the ages of 3 to 12) in Catalunya, and the mechanisms schools use to prevent and resolve them.

A 30-question digital questionnaire was sent to school management teams in Catalunya and 481 replies were received.

The results showed a low level of conflict, with minor conflicts attributed to external causes, especially highlighting the inconsistencies between the values imparted in schools and in society. They also showed that proposals for improving coexistence are varied (curricular, organizational, professional and community-based) and that, for them to succeed, the participation of teachers and the motivation, awareness and leadership of management teams are essential.

Finally, the following areas of interest should continue to be studied: the importance of leadership; the need to share valuable school experiences; and the importance of initial teacher training in dealing with conflicts in schools.

### Key words

Primary education; school violence; conflict resolution; prevention measures.

### Introduction

The breakdown of school discipline, the liquidity of authority, and the increase and diversification of school conflicts and violent episodes have brought about new challenges that teachers face daily (Hernández Prados et al., 2020). Socially, schools play a major role in the creation of positive interpersonal relationships, leading to the acquisition of the basic skills that are necessary for living in the world together.

Coexistence in schools is defined as the process of interrelation between the members of an educational system (Contreras-Rodríguez et al., 2018), although the concept of coexistence is multidimensional. It inherently contains different dimensions that lead to different approaches. The first dimension is sociological, in which context is very important. Coexistence implies living in society, and therefore the different social norms that help someone be a full member of society have to be learnt. There is also the psychological dimension, which focuses more on the individual and takes into account the feelings and emotions of others. The pedagogical and curricular dimension shows that coexistence is learned at school and in the classroom, among other places, and that conflict prevention and resolution programmes are therefore needed. It is also important to mention the organizational dimension, which leads us to think that methodological strategies can be designed to improve coexistence. Finally, there is the community dimension, taking into

account the entire school environment as an agent for the advancement of coexistence (Fierro-Evans and Carbajal-Padilla, 2019).

The terms “coexistence” and “violence” are closely related. If today so much emphasis is placed on educating for coexistence, it is because there is a perception that there is more violence and more antisocial behaviour than before.

Álvarez et al. (2014) differentiated between types of violence that can occur in the classroom: physical (direct or indirect); verbal; social exclusion; disruption in the classroom; and digital violence. Along the same lines, Ruiz, Riuró and Tesouro (2015) also talked about types of bullying (physical, verbal and social exclusion) and concluded that physical bullying is more common in boys, while verbal bullying and social exclusion predominate in girls, and that the most common place for bullying is in the playground, followed by the classroom when the teacher is not present.

Most conflicts are associated with a small group of violently disruptive students who have been mistreated, which affects the atmosphere in the classroom (Fuentes and Pérez, 2019).

“Low intensity” violence occurs among students, but also, among others, between teachers and students, among teachers, between families and teachers, and consists of insults, humiliation, racism and more. However, the concepts of disruption and indiscipline refer to students’ perception that in their classrooms there is behaviour that prevents instructional classes happening normally and, in general, problems of destruction of materials or even vandalism (Ortega et al., 2016). These are situations of violence that, in turn, have an impact on students’ overall performance (Cerdeira et al., 2018 and Penalva, 2018).

According to Mullet (2014) and Sharkey and Fenning (2012), the use of punitive measures alone may quell misbehaviour momentarily; according to Kelly (2017), in the long term these changes may be null or ineffective. Also, as Gallaro-Ceron et al. (2019) pointed out, conflict is one of the components of the school environment, and one for which the school should be prepared.

Society is today undoubtedly more sensitive to all types of violence, especially violence in schools, than it was two decades ago. There has never been so much talk about coexistence in the classroom, but above all about the growing concern of parents, educators and society in general about violence in schools, and the repercussions that this has on the education of today’s schoolchildren, who will be the society of the future.

Currently, a lot of importance is given to schools’ educational function, more than to the function of instruction, as these institutions take on many educational aspects that used to be carried out by the family (or at least shared between school and family). As Serey and Zúñiga (2020) reminded us, today a different perspective is necessary, because the world has changed, as has the way of teaching. School is the socialization space par excellence. Relationships built within the school framework, among the people who make up that framework and who are in daily contact, are a source of wealth and a valuable element when it comes to teaching and learning to live together.

The causes of violence in schools are complex: affective deficiencies in the context of the home and outside it; abandonment; increasingly complex family realities and structures; specific disadvantaged socio-economic and cultural contexts; the complexity of migration; certain messages and counter-values that can be found on social media or that are disseminated through audiovisual products that young people often watch. According to Fuentes and Pérez (2019), socio-cultural conditions within the family where clear values and norms are predominant are benchmarks of healthy coexistence both in the family and at school.

In this extremely complex situation, the genuine involvement of the entire school and educational community is necessary, and mediation is very important (Vilagrassa, 2012), in building strong relationships of coexistence among schoolchildren, and in teaching them how to resolve conflicts peacefully and through dialogue.

Consequently, after analysing problems of coexistence in infant and primary schools (from the ages of 3 to 12) and actions taken, this study aims to find solutions.

The specific objectives of the study are:

- To get to know the different types of problems of coexistence that exist in schools in Catalunya and their causes.
- To analyse projects related to coexistence in schools aimed at improving the prevention and resolution of conflicts.
- To cross reference different demographic variables (gender, school type, socioeconomic level, etc) with problems of coexistence.
- To relate problems of coexistence with different types of problems (organizational, attitudinal and external) and with the degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere in the school, to make proposals on how to improve coexistence in schools.

## Material and methods

A non-experimental descriptive and inferential methodology was used, in which both quantitative and qualitative analyses were performed.

### Sample

A questionnaire was sent electronically to a thousand management teams of schools in ZERs (Zonas de Escolarización Rural: Rural School Zones) and infant and primary schools in Catalunya. A member of the school's management or co-ordination team was asked to answer the questionnaire.

Purposive sampling was used, as the sample was based on the GROC<sup>1</sup> (Grupo de Investigación en Organización de Centros, or Organization of Educational Centres Research Group) database of education professionals, which currently has more than 4,500 entries on its distribution list and has forged its own space in the Catalan and Spanish educational panorama.

The result was a sample of 481 members of management teams working in the education of 3 to 12-year-olds (48.1%). This is a representative sample, with a maximum margin of error of 4.4% and a confidence interval of 95%.

Most of the profiles in the sample were female (71.18%), aged between 46 and 55 (53.29%), who had been the headteacher for less than 10 years (74.43%), but with extensive teaching experience (only 10.96% had less than 10 years' teaching experience and 67.86% had more than 20 years' experience).

The typology of the schools was between 100 and 500 pupils (73.24%), with less than 30 teachers (77.93%), especially in cities with less than 10,000 inhabitants (43.62%) and with a medium to low financial status (61.65%).

### Instrument

A questionnaire was prepared with 30 questions divided into the following groups:

---

- Demographic data.
- Perceptions of coexistence in schools, both within the individual school and in Catalunya as a whole.
- The nature of conflicts and their incidence rate.
- Proposals for improvement implemented by schools.
- The implementation of actions aimed at improvement.

The original version was checked by 12 experts. The final digital questionnaire incorporated their advice.

Qualitative analysis was performed on the proposals for improvement, and both descriptive analysis (using Excel 365) and inferential analysis (using SPSSx V.27) were performed on the remaining questions to detect existing relationships between different variables. Before carrying out the statistical analysis, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ( $n > 50$ ) was applied to all the variables, and it was observed that all of them did not follow normality ( $p < .05$ ). Therefore, nonparametric tests were used. The U de Mann Whitney-test was used for independent samples to see the relationship between a quantitative and a qualitative variable with only two response options, and the Test de Kusktral Wallis in the case of variables with more than two options. Spearman's Rho was used to analyse possible correlations between non-continuous quantitative variables.

## Results

Participants' perception that coexistence was getting worse in society was much more pessimistic (69.52%) than their perception of the situation in their own school (35.92%). Likewise, there was a tendency to optimism with regards to satisfaction with the atmosphere in schools (65.58% rated this satisfaction as 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5).

The overall incidence rate of conflicts was low (Table 1). The conflicts among students that stood out most, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest incidence at the school and 5 the highest), were passivity and indifference to work, and behaviour that made teaching difficult. In terms of types of conflict (Table 2), in conflicts between teachers and students, the most highly ranked option was that of relationship difficulties; among teachers, occupational mobility stood out; and in conflicts with families, insufficient relationships with the school.

Table 1.  
*The nature of conflicts*

	Average	Typical deviation
Passivity and indifference to work	2.38	1.01
Behaviour that makes teaching difficult	2.36	1.12
Verbal aggression	2.18	1.04
Students changing schools	2.06	0.94
Behaviour that makes it difficult for the school to function	2.02	1.00

Table 2.  
Highest ranked types of conflict according to typology

Type of conflict			Average	Typical deviation
Conflicts between teachers and students	and	Relationship difficulties	2.13	1.06
		Low recognition of teachers' authority	2.01	1.01
Conflicts among teachers	among	Occupational mobility	2.25	1.09
		Excessive delegation of problems of coexistence to tutors or management teams.	2.17	1.05
Conflicts families	with	Insufficient relationships with the school	2.40	1.17

Among the causes of conflict (scale from 1 to 5) (Table 3) attributable to factors external to the school, the highest ranked was inconsistency between the values imparted at school and those imparted in society; among the internal causes, the highest ranked factor was the characteristics of the students.

Table 3.  
External and internal causes of conflict

Type of cause		Average	Typical deviation
External causes	Inconsistency between values imparted at school and those in society	3.59	1.14
	Low implication of families	2.90	1.18
	Changes in the family model	2.86	1.17
	Negative influence of the media	2.80	1.11
	Excessive educational legislation	2.73	1.31
	Low social consideration of teachers and school	2.61	1.27
	Crisis of social values	2.30	1.14
Internal causes	Characteristics of the students	2.60	1.19
	Low level of learning	2.21	1.06
	Instability of teachers in schools	2.11	1.02

The results of the qualitative analysis were classified into four areas to make them easier to understand, both for the proposals for improvement that had a positive result (Table 4) and the proposals for improvement that had an unsatisfactory result (Table 5): 1) education/curriculum; 2) school organization; 3) professional organization; and 4) community organization.

Table 4.  
Proposals for improvement that had a positive result

Education/curriculum
Cross-cutting mentoring programming
Assemblies with students; individual and group tutorials
Participation in community projects and plans (Psychosocial Education Project, Philosophy 3/18, etc), interclass and interdisciplinary projects
Social/emotional skills programmes that develop assertiveness and empathy
Coexistence and conflict resolution workshops
Cooperative games programmes/cooperative work in the classroom/occasional coexistence days
School-pupil coexistence contract
Activities at break times
School organization
Protocol for action in the event of a conflict shared with all the staff
Control of students when they arrive at and leave school, to ensure punctuality and to prevent conflicts
Teacher training in peaceful conflict resolution
Weekly coordination of teaching teams
Increased information: regular bulletins for teachers and students
Coexistence commission
Professional organization
Welcome new teachers to the school and take care of them
Outings and meals with the staff
Give tutors a leading role with support from the management team. Value their work
Community organization
Training workshops with parents
Transform the school into a learning community. Involve families in their children's education
Work with the school's Parent - Student Association (AMPA)
Scholarships for extracurricular activities so that no one is excluded for financial reasons. Socialization of textbooks and teaching materials
Get-togethers and/or trips with families outside school hours
Joint actions with the City/Town Council

Table 5.  
Proposals for improvement that had an unsatisfactory result

Education/curriculum
Take special needs students out of the regular classroom for parallel activities
Open Classroom project for conflictive students or those with a lot of problems
School organization
Teacher surveillance of playgrounds, toilets and corridors
Excessive bureaucratization of discipline (warnings, reports of conduct against the rules of coexistence, reports, etc) and centralization of disciplinary measures
Non-consensual regulations for the use of facilities
“Games without a ball” day in the playground
Training sessions for teachers that are unsuitable both in terms of the timetable and/or calendar and the characteristics of the potential trainers
Certain occasional activities (Coexistence Day, Peace Day, etc).
Professional organization
Training sessions aimed at improving coexistence
Community organization
Integrate newcomer families into the dynamics of the school: meetings, interviews, parties, etc. Lack of involvement of the Parent - Student Association (AMPA) in this integration
Low take up of School for Parents training sessions
Community Education Plan that did not meet expectations
Networking with institutions, due to the lack of commitment of certain external agents: Educational Psychology Teams (EAP), Social Services, etc
Leaflets and posters produced by the Administration that failed to have the expected impact

Some proposals for improvement were evaluated positively by some schools but negatively by others, as in the case of the occasional Coexistence Days or training the teaching staff (if the training did not meet the full expectations of the teaching staff). This led to the need to analyse the internal structure of the proposals for improvement, to see what made the same proposal positive for one school and negative for another.

Most of the proposals for improvement came from management teams and teaching staff, who generally planned and led them. The responses showed that the teaching staff received a great deal of information, both orally and in writing. They also largely participated in the design and planning of the Improvement Plan, debated the relevant aspects of the Plan in different sessions and took part in making decisions. Their participation decreased in making amendments and/or improvements in writing.

Of the constraints on the implementation of the proposals for improvement (Table 6), the contradiction between the values which education tries to impart and those that are



experienced in society had the highest average, as in the external causes of conflict (Table 3). Consequently, factors external to schools caused the most difficulties, as this was where it was most difficult to act.

Table 6.  
*Constraints on the implementation of the proposals for improvement*

Type of constraint	Average	Typical deviation
Contradiction between the values which education tries to impart and those that are experienced in society	3.78	1.07
Impossibility of getting some families to cooperate	3.60	1.10
Having to count on teaching staff's goodwill	3.32	1.11

An inferential analysis was performed to relate the demographic variables to the perception of the state of coexistence, problems of coexistence, and the difficulties foreseen in the implementation of actions aimed at improving coexistence.

It was observed that women are better attuned to achieving a good atmosphere of coexistence ( $P=.040$ ) (U de Mann Whitney test).

In reference to the school type variable (Kruskal-Wallis test), in private schools, very serious behavioural and peer relationship problems ( $P=.006$ ) and problems among teachers within the school ( $P=.006$ ) were ranked higher, while in state schools, problems deriving from occupational mobility and absenteeism among teachers were ranked higher ( $P=.001$ ).

By location, urban schools were found to have more problems than those located in ZERs in all but three of the analysed areas, where no significant differences were observed (Table 7). These were: high intensity problems of relationships with teachers; the perception of the state of coexistence in the school; and problems arising from the poor delimitation of teachers' and students' roles.

The relationship between the various problems and the number of pupils in the school (Spearman's Rho test) was consistent with the above; very serious behavioural and peer relationship problems ( $P=.000$ ) and problems among teachers within the school ( $P=.010$ ) increased as the number of pupils in the school increased. It was also observed that occupational mobility and absenteeism problems among teachers ( $P=.000$ ) and students ( $P=.003$ ) and minor behavioural problems with peers ( $P=.020$ ) were greater in schools with 301 to 750 students ( $P=.002$ ).

When we looked at socio-economic status (Kruskal-Wallis test), we observed that problems among teaching staff due to occupational mobility and absenteeism of teachers ( $P=.006$ ) and pupils ( $P=.000$ ), behavioural problems and minor problems in relationships with peers ( $P=.000$ ), low intensity problems with teachers ( $P=.006$ ), low intensity problems in relationships with teachers ( $P=.003$ ) and behavioural problems and serious problems in relationships with peers ( $P=.000$ ) increased as socio-economic status decreased.

Table 7.  
Constraints on the implementation of proposals for improvement according to type of problem

	Sig.
Very serious behavioural and peer relationship problems	.041
Serious behavioural and peer relationship problems	.001
Minor behavioural and peer relationship problems	.005
Among school teaching staff/interns	.038
Among teachers due to mobility	.030
Among teachers due to easing off from duties	.001
Among teachers due to excessive involvement of school management team	.029
Occupational mobility and absenteeism	.001
In relationships with teachers/High Intensity	.710
In relationships with teachers/Low Intensity	.002
In the perception of the state of coexistence in the school	.365
Due to poor delimitation of teachers' and students' roles	.350

Very high correlations (Spearman's Rho test) were found between problems of coexistence and the difficulties foreseen in the implementation of proposals for improving coexistence.

Table 8.  
Significance of problems of coexistence according to type of problem

	Organizational problems	Attitudinal problems	Problems external to the school
Behavioural and peer relationship problems	Very serious	.053	.176(**)
	Serious	.076	.061
	Minor	.135(*)	.193(**)
	Occupational mobility and absenteeism	-.078	.077
Problems in student-teacher relationships	High intensity	.026	.087
	Low intensity	.159(**)	.171(**)
	Poor delimitation of teachers' and students' roles	.118(*)	.175(**)
Problems among teachers	Within the school	.140(*)	.247(**)

	Easing off from duties	.195(**)	.301(**)	.225(**)
	Occupational mobility and absenteeism	.101	.220(**)	.110
	Due to excessive involvement of school management team	.113(*)	.225(**)	.177(**)
Family problems	Problems of coexistence	.044	.168(**)	.272(**)

(\*\*) Correlation is significant at .01 (bilateral).

(\*) Correlation is significant at .05 (bilateral).

Table 8 shows that there was a higher correlation for attitudinal problems and problems external to the school (collaboration with organizations and families), while the correlation decreased significantly for organizational problems.

The attitudinal problems with the highest correlations ( $p < .01$ ) were among teachers. However, there was also a relationship between attitudinal problems and behavioural and peer relationship problems, both minor ( $r = 0.193$ ) and very serious ( $r = 0.176$ ), although there were also attitudinal problems due to the poor delimitation of teachers' and students' roles ( $r = 0.175$ ), among others.

The most relevant problems that were external to schools ( $P < .01$ ) were related to minor behavioural and peer relationship problems ( $r = 0.261$ ), to problems among teachers due to easing off from duties ( $r = 0.225$ ) to low intensity teacher-pupil relationship problems ( $r = 0.202$ ) and to due to excessive involvement of school management team ( $r = 0.177$ ).

Problems among teaching staff due to easing off from duties ( $r = 0.195$ ) stood out among the organizational problems.

High correlations (Spearman's Rho test) were also found between all the problems of coexistence and the degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere of coexistence in the school ( $P < .01$ ), except between the degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere of coexistence in schools and high intensity problems in the relationship between students and teachers (Table 9).

Table 9.

*Significance of problems of coexistence and the degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere of coexistence in the school*

		Degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere of coexistence in the school
Behavioural and peer relationship problems	Very serious	-.290(**)
	Serious	-.308(**)
	Minor	-.314(**)
	Mobility and absenteeism	-.250(**)
Problems in student-teacher relationships	High intensity	-.072
	Low intensity	-.343(**)

	Poor delimitation of teachers' and students' roles	-.162(**)
Problems among teachers	Within the school	-.301(**)
	Easing off from duties	-.345(**)
	Mobility and absenteeism	-.228(**)
	Excessive involvement of school management team	-.240(**)
Family problems	Problems of coexistence	-.298(**)

(\*\*) Correlation is significant at .01 (bilateral).

### Discussions and conclusions

Our first objective was to find out what the main problems of coexistence in schools were. We concluded that there were few serious problems of coexistence among pupils in Primary Education, but some problems of coexistence were detected.

These problems often derived from non-compliance with classroom or school rules, episodes of disruption and a lack of punctuality (often not attributable to the students, especially at the youngest ages), as corroborated in studies by Córdoba, Del Rey and Ortega (2016).

Most of the problems of coexistence among the teaching staff were caused by a lack of engagement of some members of the teaching staff, deficient training, low willingness to collaborate and staff instability. There were also problems of coexistence of the teaching staff due to deficient management of tutoring.

Problems of coexistence related to families were seen as coming from a lack of support for teachers (different values, non-attendance at meetings and/or interviews at the school, different ways of managing conflict at school and at home, lack of understanding with teachers, etc).

It is particularly noteworthy that the perception was that conflict has increased in recent years, both at school and in Catalunya as a whole. However, schools perceived a lower degree of conflict in school when compared with elsewhere. The degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere of coexistence at school was high, as indicated by Penalva (2018). This is a paradox, although it can be explained by the fact that teachers often realized that the situation at their own school was getting worse over time, but the high level of adaptability of the teaching staff enabled them to adjust to the reality in their school.

Our second objective was to analyse projects aimed at improving coexistence in schools. Proposals for improvement came mainly from the management team and the teaching staff, who generally planned and led them. Teachers said that they received a great deal of information, both orally and in writing. They also participated in the design and planning of the improvement plan, in discussions about it and in decision making. Their participation decreased when making amendments and/or improvements in writing, due to their heavy workload.

The biggest constraints on the implementation of the proposals for improvement were leadership, teachers' engagement, the participation of families and collaboration between entities. These factors help us understand that the same proposal may have had positive results in one school while it failed in another. Merma-Molina et al. (2019) explained that the education administration implemented some prevention and intervention programmes that

did not have the expected results, such as coexistence plans. These same authors concluded that a holistic, practical and realistic approach to coexistence in schools was needed, aimed at changing school culture.

The third objective was to cross reference demographic variables with problems of coexistence. Female teachers were more sensitive to prioritizing interventions aimed at improving coexistence, as well as teaching coordinators, who observed a higher rate of conflict because, in general, they manage conflicts in their schools.

Privately-owned state-subsidized schools saw a higher level of serious conflicts because they have recently experienced more changes from admitting more students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) from disadvantaged socio-economic situations. In the past, the percentage of these students in these schools was much lower. It is worth noting that the presence of SEN students was generally considered to be an important internal cause of problems of coexistence.

Another conclusion is that ZERs and schools with fewer pupils reported the lowest levels of conflict because they have exceptional conditions for working in depth on the issue of coexistence: a small number of pupils and teachers; a rural, often privileged, environment, allowing for large spaces; a feeling of freedom of movement; etc.

A further conclusion was that schools with students from low and lower-middle socio-economic backgrounds had higher rates of conflict. In these schools, teachers adjusted their expectations downwards, leading to a lower sense of discouragement, whereas in schools with a medium-high socio-economic level, expectations can be high, which can lead to disappointment if they are not met.

The causes of conflict were divided into internal and external causes, with the external causes having the highest percentages. Two values for internal causes stood out; namely those attributed to the students themselves (personal characteristics and school failure) and to teacher mobility.

Our fourth objective sought to relate problems of coexistence with different types of difficulties in implementing proposals for improving coexistence, and with the degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere in the school: the more intense the problem of coexistence, the lower the degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere of coexistence at the school. The problems that most affected the atmosphere at the school were minor behavioural problems in relationships with classmates, low intensity problems in relationships with teaching staff, problems among teachers due to easing off from duties, and difficulties in relationships with families.

Teachers' attitudes had a major influence on problems of coexistence in schools. It would therefore be worth studying in future the need to work at universities on the importance of conflict management in schools, to provide teachers with the necessary tools and thus improve coexistence in the classroom. A pedagogical proposal could be designed that could be incorporated into teaching degree syllabuses, either as a subject itself or as different topics that could be included in existing subjects.

As a proposal for improving coexistence in schools, it is important to work on management teams' leadership so they can facilitate the involvement of the school community, the smooth implementation of the whole improvement process, and to mitigate those factors that hinder the implementation of improvement processes. This study is in line with the results of Tirado and Conde (2016), who corroborated the fact that "the influence of leadership, education about conflict, the democratic formulation of rules, training and the

‘coexistence classroom’, act to reduce problems, although to different extents, depending on the preventive nature of the actions” (p.153).

It would also be interesting to study ways of sharing proposals for improvement of coexistence in schools, both those that achieved the results desired by the school community and those that were unsuccessful, as shared knowledge optimizes resources (what works in one school may be exportable to other schools, with all the necessary limitations and all the possible variations). Likewise, it would be a good idea to communicate to the educational community everything that is being done in schools that the community itself can take advantage of, to continue to dive deeper into the same subject and to work in a coordinated manner. It would also be good to use information and communication technologies to create a virtual portal where all these proposals could be collected in an organized way and communicated to schools.

## References

- Álvarez García, D.; Dobarro, A.; Álvarez, L.; Núñez, J.C., Rodríguez, C. (2014). School violence in Secondary schools in Asturias from the perspective of students. *Educación XX1*, 17 (2):337-360. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.17.2.11494>
- Aramendi, P. & Ayerbe, P. (2009). Aprender a convivir: un reto en la educación secundaria obligatoria. *Educación y diversidad*, 3:61-105.
- Cerda, G., Pérez, C., Elipec, P., Casas, J.A., Del Rey, R. (2018). Convivencia escolar y su relación con el rendimiento académico del alumnado en Educación primaria. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 24(1):46-52 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicod.2018.05.001>
- Contreras-Rodríguez, S., Colón-Luna, N., Gonzales-Montalvo, C., Machado-De la Cruz, P., Melo-Vásquez, M., Vergara-Luna, M. (2018). Convivencia escolar y solución de conflictos mediante la investigación como estrategia pedagógica. *Cultura. Educación y Sociedad*, 9(3):63-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17981/culteduc.9.3.2018.07>
- Córdoba, F., Del Rey, R., Ortega, R. (2016). Conflictividad: un estudio sobre problemas de convivencia escolar en Educación Primaria. *Temas de Educación*, 22(2):189-205. Retrieved from <https://revistas.userena.cl/index.php/teeducacion/article/view/806>
- Fierro-Evans, C. & Carbajal-Padilla, P. (2019). Convivencia escolar: Una revisión del concepto. *Psicoperspectivas*, 18(1):1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-vol18-issuet1-fulltext-1486>
- Fuentes, L., Pérez, L. (2019). Convivencia escolar: una mirada desde las familias. *TELOS. Revista de Estudios Interdisciplinarios en Ciencias Sociales*, 21(1):61-85, Retrieved from <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6773126>
- Gallardo Ceron, B.N., Hernández Zuluaga, G.D., Monsalve Giraldo, M.I., Barrientos Burgos, H.R. (2019). Convivencia, conflicto y pacto, hacia la construcción participativa de escenarios de convivencia escolar. *Revista Electrónica En Educación Y Pedagogía*, 3(5):62-75. <https://doi.org/10.15658/rev.electron.educ.pedagog19.09030504>
- Hernández Prados, M.Á., Penalva López, A., Guerrero Romera, C. (2020). Profesorado y convivencia escolar: necesidades formativas. *Magister: revista de formación del profesorado e investigación educativa*. <https://doi.org/10.17561/reid.n20.3>
- Kelly, D.R. (2017). Methods for reducing violence in schools: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 7(1):200-209. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jedp.v7n1p200>

- Merma-Molina, G., Ávalos Ramos, M.A., Martínez Ruiz, M.A. (2019). ¿Por qué no son eficaces los planes de convivencia escolar en España? *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 37(2):561-579. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/rie.37.2.313561>
- Mullet, J.H. (2014). Restorative discipline: From getting even to getting well. *Children & Schools*, 36(3):157-162. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdu011>
- Ortega-Ruiz, R., Del Rey, R., Casas, J.A. (2016). La Convivencia Escolar: clave en la predicción del Bullying. *Revista Iberoamericana De Evaluación Educativa*, 6(2):91-102. <https://revistas.uam.es/riee/article/view/3406>
- Penalva López, A. (2018). La convivencia escolar. Un reto del siglo XXI. *Revista Electrónica De Investigación Y Docencia (REID)*, 20:41-58. <https://doi.org/10.17561/reid.n20.3>
- Ruiz, R.; Riuró, M., Tesouro, M. (2015). Study about bullying in the upper cycle of primary education. *Educación XX1*, 18(1):345-368. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educXX1.18.1.12384>
- Serey, D., Zúñiga, P. (2020). School coexistence post COVID 19: A didactic proposal from the educational coaching. *IJERI: International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, (15):143–161. <https://doi.org/10.46661/ijeri.5005>
- Sharkey, J.D., Fenning, P.A. (2012). Rationale for designing school contexts in support of proactive discipline. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(2):95-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2012.646641>
- Tirado, R., Conde, S. (2016). Análisis estructural de la gestión de la convivencia escolar en centros de buenas prácticas de Andalucía (España). *Educatio Siglo XXI*, 19(2):153-178. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educXX1.16459>
- Villagrasa, C. (2012). Los conflictos de derecho en el aula y las alternativas de gestión y resolución. *Educatio Siglo XXI*, 2:149-166. <https://revistas.um.es/educatio/article/view/153731>

### Acknowledgements

This work is part of the research project funded by the University Grants Management Agency and of Research.

It has also received a translation grant from the Department of Pedagogy of our university.

### Informed consent

The questionnaire presented was answered electronically by members of the management teams primary schools.

All the participants were sent a message informing them of the investigation and inviting them to participate in it. They were also informed of the anonymity of the questionnaire and of the freedom to respond to it.

Those who wanted to participate in it accessed link where the anonymous questionnaire was located.