

Lozano-Díaz, A., López-Berlanga, M. C., Sánchez-Muñoz, C., and Martínez-Martínez, A. M. (2025). Influence of the social and educational context and justification of the use of violence among young people and adolescents. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.588301>

Traducido con  DeepL

Influence of Educational and Social Contexts and Justification for the Use of Violence among Young People and Adolescents

Influencia del contexto social y educativo y justificación del uso de la violencia entre jóvenes y adolescentes

Antonia Lozano-Díaz*, María Carmen López-Berlanga**, Carlos Sánchez-Muñoz¹ ** and Ana María Martínez-Martínez**.

*Centre for Research for the Study of Migration and Intercultural Relations (CEMyRI)

**Department of Education. University of Almería (Spain)

Abstract

In today's society, the proliferation of violent attitudes among adolescents is becoming increasingly made known, pointing to this group as the origin of violent acts affected by the phenomenon of radicalization that can lead to violent extremism. In this study, we focused on finding out how adolescents justify the use of violence and whether the characteristics of the environment play an important role in justifying and predisposing them to the use of violence. The total sample consisted of 1170 students from secondary schools in western Almería, where the average age ranged from 12 to 19 years old. Data collection was carried out by means of a validated questionnaire and a quantitative analysis. The results show that young people and adolescents

² **Correspondence:** Carlos Sánchez Muñoz, cs864@ual.es, Carretera Sacramento, s/n, 04120 La Cañada, Almería, Despacho 0.84

justify the use of violence as a reaction to the influence of external factors linked to the context, the implication of them being the need to develop educational policies of prevention and intervention as elementary factors in the fight against violence and radicalization among the student body.

Keywords: adolescents; extremism; radicalization; violence

Resumen

En la sociedad actual cada vez más se dan a conocer la proliferación de actitudes violentas entre los y las adolescentes señalando a este grupo como origen de actos de violencia afectados por el fenómeno de la radicalización que puede llevar a extremismos violentos. En este estudio nos centramos en conocer de qué forma justifican la población los adolescentes el uso de la violencia y si las características del entorno, como las relaciones en el centro educativo, percepción de violencia en el contexto cotidiano, consumo de drogas y otros, tienen un papel importante en la justificación y en la predisposición del uso de la violencia. El total de la muestra participante ha sido de 1170 alumnos/as de institutos del poniente almeriense donde la media de edad oscila entre los 12 a 19 años. La recogida de datos se realizó mediante cuestionario validado y análisis de carácter cuantitativo. Los resultados muestran que las y los jóvenes y adolescentes justifican el uso de la violencia como una reacción frente a la influencia de factores externos vinculados con el contexto. Las implicaciones de este estudio estriban en informar la necesidad de desarrollar políticas educativas que supongan la prevención e intervención ante el desarrollo de conductas violentas y extremistas entre el alumnado.

Palabras clave: adolescentes; extremismo; radicalización; violencia

Introduction and objectives

Violence and radicalisation according to Tamayo et al. (2021) can be defined as a process that begins with embracing extremist ideas and values that, in certain circumstances, can end up being defended by violent means. This is a fact that we believe has become a reality among adolescents that needs to be addressed by society as a whole

For some years now, different phenomena have been propagating the idea of an increase in the proliferation of violent attitudes in adolescence and early adulthood. This population group has been identified in various official documents as the source of acts of violence affected by the "phenomenon of radicalisation leading to violent extremism" (European Union, 2017, p. 8).

It is in this context that the interest and purpose of this study was born: to find out how the adolescent population justifies the use of violence and whether the characteristics of the environment play an important role in the justification and predisposition to the use of violence.

Likewise, and taking into account these characteristics, adolescence has been understood as a highly influential group, justified by the thought that "they are not yet as competent, reliable or responsible as adults" (Casas, 2010, p. 20) (). In this context, the

importance of maturational transitions is framed as an essential component in the process of radicalisation and attitudes of extreme violence (Jahnke et al., 2020; Schils and Verhage, 2017;).

The vulnerability of adolescents means that attitudes towards violence increase or decrease depending on different characteristics of their own environment, factors that must be analysed from an inter- and multidisciplinary perspective, which will allow us to understand the phenomenon of radicalisation and its mechanisms (Bazaga and Tamayo, 2021). Education must be understood as a consolidated tool against radicalisation and all types of extremist violence.

The concepts of radicalisation and violent extremism should be taken as a starting point, the former being a gradual process whereby the individual increases, acquires and develops attitudes of extreme violence (Doosje et al., 2016; McCauley and Moskaleiko, 2008), and the latter being the set of beliefs that justify and support social, political, religious or ideological violence (Borum, 2011).

Difficulties with conceptualisation, due to its breadth, hinder the limitation between what are considered radicalisation actions or behaviours and what are not (Almagro, 2016), making it even more complicated to sort out the originating and resulting situations. Radicalisation, therefore, should not be understood as an individual, isolated situation, but rather as a dynamic process that depends on different internal and external factors, such as ideological, political, religious or personal reasons (Massa, 2019).

According to the studies of Lösel et al. (2018), there are five levels that group the existence of external factors influencing the radicalisation of violence : individual level, family level, school level, peer group level and community level. At each of these levels, the link to violence will be related as follows:

- 1) *The individual level:* the link will be linked both by the characteristics of the people in the environment and the subject's own perceptions, where dehumanisation takes place, a key process in understanding how mainly normal individuals can become involved in terrorist activities. In addition, the radical group and ideology help to legitimise a pre-existing violence in the subject. The aggressive and destructive instincts that dominate the fantasy life of these individuals find in outward projection a form of justification and ideal expression.
Likewise, the dissolution of moral, religious or civic values in modern societies leads to a sense of irresolution that makes young people more inclined towards religious fundamentalisms and possibly radical ideologies.
- 2) *The family level:* linked and related to parenting styles and the influence of relatives. This level is characterised by the fragility and precariousness of the family group, vital deficiencies, traumas or anxieties during childhood and adolescence, affiliation and religious practice. This sometimes leads to isolation and the absence of opposing views in the family, leading to violent reactions provoked by unequal or discriminatory socio-economic and religious conditions and contributing to the phenomenon of radicalisation.
- 3) *The school level:* will be determined by the link with the school and the integration of the subject in the school in his/her relationships with peers and teachers, characterised by the vulnerability of the person to the diversity of situations and

experiences in which he/she is immersed in the family and social environment.

- 4) *Peer group*: can exert both positive and negative influence. Most radicalised individuals had a role model, an inspirational figure in the radical group that initiated the radicalisation process. Group threat perceived as an important contributor to maintaining a radical belief system and which can take three different forms: symbolic threat, realistic threat and intergroup anxiety.
- 5) *The community level*, which delimits the degree of social integration. At this level, authors such as Parrat-Dayan (2012) state that there is a "narcissistic contract" between the individual and the group and that this contract is crucial: the group offers a place and a role to the subject, and in exchange, must repeat the same statements and ensure the permanence of this transmission. Where the "ghettoised existences" associated with the feeling of dehumanisation experienced by the subjects through social contempt, without forgetting that the link between religious fundamentalism and radicalisation is complex.

As can be seen, the different factors that intervene in the radicalisation of the individual are of different natures - the context or the social situation - and can, in both cases, be used as tools for slowing down or accelerating it.

In order to respond to the problems of radicalisation and violence, prevention is necessary, which must be supported by networks of collaboration and cooperation promoted and established by individuals in conjunction with public institutions and the political system. In recent years, there has been a proliferation of documents produced by governmental institutions, such as the European Union, with discourses that "warn about the radicalisation of youth, setting the priorities of European strategic programmes that end up materialising in the funding and implementation of specific research and intervention projects in the field of education" (Montero, 2018, p. 296). However, it is not enough to establish guidelines once the events have occurred, but it is necessary to know the origin, causes and factors that favour violent manifestations, whether in attitudes or activities.

The emergence of violent and even terrorist actions has experienced an increase in due to the new methods that have emerged with technological advances that have increased the capacity for financing, recruitment, training and propaganda (Massa, 2019). The radicalisation of actions has seen its extreme manifestation in terrorism (Jalloul, 2018), which is why tackling it has been postulated as a fundamental fact for the correct coexistence of the population and the maintenance of Human Rights. The massive use of these technologies by the younger population can be understood as one of the reasons why the phenomenon has especially targeted this social group; that is why actions against radicalisation are so important, which should have as their main objectives the strengthening of the legal framework against terrorism and violent extremism and, fundamentally, the prevention of radicalisation in the places where it occurs: schools, prisons and the internet (Frías, 2019).

Furthermore, in the study of radicalisation we find the binomial between a component of thought and a component of action that establishes as intrinsic within the culture of violence the existence of social models that allow the creation of frames of reference where violence, in all its spheres, finds its justification (Waldmann, 2007). Precisely in view of

these circumstances, research is being carried out to ascertain the characteristics of the environment and the factors that influence the radicalisation process, the first of these being understood as one of the most relevant, as it constitutes the "ideological greenhouses" (Bazaga and Tamayo, 2021), where the younger generations are especially vulnerable.

The existence of an ideology propagated and disseminated to the social group of adolescents determines the violent actions that arise from it as "a set of common and widely agreed rules that a person assumes and that helps them to regulate and determine their behaviour" (Trujillo et al., 2006, p. 281) and, the studies by Tamayo et al. (2021) add, that there are more possibilities of violent radicalisation and that this is carried out more quickly, in cases where the use of violence is justified among the ideas.

Prevention as an elementary factor in policies to combat violence and terrorism, the search for the causes and patterns of justification for terrorist acts is the order of the day, in fact it cannot be understood without being interpreted as a process of identity search by which individuals "adopt and adhere to extremist values and ideas which, in certain circumstances, can lead to the commission of acts of terrorism" (De la Corte, 2015, p. 42). This search for identity is a basic characteristic of adolescents and minors, hence the particular importance of knowing how they justify it and what factors they rely on.

In conclusion to what has been said so far in this study, there are two main objectives;

- to find out how justifies the use of violence by adolescents and young people.
- establish which characteristics of young people's environment play an important role in justifying and predisposing them to the use of violence .

The following hypothesis is formulated as the main working hypothesis:

- The young people who are most likely to justify and defend the use of violence are also those who are most likely to perceive violence in their environment.

Method

Population and Sample

The sample consisted of 1170 students belonging to three schools in the west of Almería (57.9%), one school in Almería city (33%) and one school in the centre of Madrid (9%). The selection of the sample was incidental and guided by the ease of access, i.e., we counted those schools that allowed access and collaboration with the research. In relation to sex, the distribution was fairly equal, with 49.7% being women (581), 47.4% men (554) and the rest were self-categorised as "Other" (35 subjects representing 3%). The mean age was 15.6 years within an age range of 12 to 19 years

Design and procedure

The measurement instrument or questionnaire on justification for the use of violence was adjusted after its initial design through a pencil-and-paper test with secondary school students. The questionnaire with the scale (the scale is a part, 2 items, of the total questionnaire) was digitised and administered using the online survey application LimeSurvey. In the previous months, schools were contacted to explain the purpose of

the study and to obtain their collaboration, families were informed and their authorisation was required for this purpose. The evaluation was carried out during the usual school hours and within the classes, and the information was collected throughout the month of May 2022. Pupils accessed the questionnaire via a QR code; those who did not have a mobile phone, or who for some reason could not access the application, had the questionnaire available to them in pencil and paper format.

Instrument

The completed questionnaire allowed us to collect information such as: socio-demographic information such as age, relationships at school, economic/cultural level of parents, integration at school, perception of violence, cyberbullying, acceptance/rejection of other cultures, justification of the use of violence and similar. In total, the questionnaire consisted of 34 questions. The definition of constructs was carried out through the research project team meetings, and the construct of justification of violence, questions 13 and 14 of the questionnaire, which had already been used in previous studies such as Tamayo et al. (2021), were assumed to be valid and were not modified in any way.

These questions, 13 and 14 of the questionnaire, would be the scale to take into account in the present research on the justification of the use of violence in the way Tamayo et al. (2021) do, and they will allow us to know the acceptance of the use of violence and the willingness to use violence through two broad sections such as "Acceptance of the use of violence" and "Willingness to use violence":

A. "Acceptance of the use of violence".

1 To what extent is the use of violence acceptable to you?

- In many circumstances
- In certain circumstances
- Only in extreme circumstances
- Under no circumstances
- NS/NC

B. "Willingness to use violence".

2. Would you personally be willing to use violence in the following situations?

- To defend your ideas or values
- To defend your friends or other family members
- Because of your political beliefs
- To defend your rights
- To defend your country
- To defend your religion
- To fight injustice

For the second question the response options were: Yes, totally (1); Yes, to some extent (2); No, not really (3); No, not at all (4).

With the question "Willingness to use violence" Tamayo et al. (2021) carry out a factor analysis that allows them to obtain two principal components:

- Component 1: Sociotropic disposition to violence. In this component, the subjects link their disposition to violence to their convictions and values of any kind; it is fundamentally idealistic in nature. It consists of items 1, 3, 5 and 6.
- Component 2: egocentric disposition to violence, associated with individual motivations and interests that directly affect them. It would consist of items 2, 4 and 7.

According to Tamayo et al. (2021), by combining two levels of disposition to violence, high/low, a combination of 4 subtypes can be obtained, which the authors characterise as follows:

- *Pacifists*: low socio-tropic and egocentric disposition to violence. They protest peacefully through official mechanisms such as demonstrations or the collection of signatures.
- *Self-defensive*: low socio-tropic disposition, but high egocentric disposition to violence. They are people who mobilise in the face of personal grievances suffered directly or in their close environment. They establish two subtypes in this group: resentful (seeking revenge) and indignant (seeking reintegration of what has been lost).
- *Altruistic*: high socio-anthropic disposition, but low egocentric disposition to violence. They are mobilised by community ideals to which they are highly committed, even if they are not directly affected by them.
- *Doubly aggrieved*: high socio-tropic and egocentric disposition to violence. This set incorporates a feeling of affectation of their interests and values that affect them both individually and as a community, they identify themselves in opposition to other groups whom they hold responsible for their humiliations and problems.

Likewise, in order to find out to what extent this item transformed into a scale that seeks to determine the level of "Willingness to use violence" is reliable, an analysis of its reliability is carried out. The value obtained for Cronbach's Alpha is .827 for the total of 7 items that make up the scale, which gives a good indication of the reliability of the measure.

Results

Table 1 shows the percentage of young people who show their level of willingness to use violence. In relation to the first item, "To defend your ideas or values", 83.5% of young people would not use violence for this purpose, only 4% would be totally willing to use violence. This willingness to use violence "To defend your friends or family" increases very much in this option as 39.5% would be totally willing to use it and 43.8% would use it to some extent, those who refuse to use violence at all for this purpose are 5.3%. When it comes to using violence "To defend your political beliefs" barely 8% of the

total number of students would be willing to use violence in any way. In relation to the use of violence "To defend your rights", more than half of the students would not be willing to use violence. When defending their country, 16.3% of young people would be totally willing to use violence, 65.6% of the total sample would not be willing to use violence. In relation to the use of violence "To defend your religion", 9.9% are totally willing to use violence, 79.5% of the young people are not willing to use violence for religious reasons. For the last question on the willingness to use violence "To fight against injustice" it can be observed that more than half of them would be willing to use violence to confront what they consider unjust, 17.3% would not be at all willing to use violence to fight against injustice.

Table 1

Willingness to use violence Would you personally be willing to use violence in the following situations?

	Yes, fully (%)	Yes, to some extent (%)	No, not really (%)	Not at all (%)	Total (%)
1. To defend your ideas or values	4	12.5	36.4	47.1	100
2. To defend your friends or family	39.5	43.8	11.4	5.3	100
3. To defend your political ideas	2.7	4.5	22.9	69.8	100
4. To defend your rights	13.4	34.3	30.8	21.5	100
5. To defend your country	16.3	18	28.5	37.2	100
6. To defend your religion	9.9	10.6	24.3	55.2	100
7. To fight injustice	16.5	37.2	29.1	17.3	100

Table 2 shows the results of the factor analysis of the scale-transformed Disposition to the use of violence. As in the proposal by Tamayo et al. (2021), two principal components are obtained in which the 7 proposed items are distributed. The distribution of the questions in each of the components is similar to the aforementioned study. Thus, the distribution would be as shown in Table 2, component 1 would be composed of items 1, 3, 5 and 6 and component 2 by items 2, 4 and 7. Subsequently, and following the strategy of Tamayo et al. (2021), we proceeded to the elaboration, with the data obtained in this study, of the typology of willingness to use violence. To this end, a dichotomisation of the variables generated from each Component has been carried out, establishing a score that assigns the cases to one of two categories (0 = Low; 1=High) based on the analysis of the distribution of each variable and the calculation of the contingency table. Table 3 shows the typology obtained, similar to the study by Tamayo et al. (2021), young people with a low socio-tropic disposition to violence are in the majority, although to a much lesser extent than that obtained by these authors (50.2% in this study compared to 71.9% in the aforementioned study). In this study, the majority of young people with a high disposition (sociotropic and egocentric) to violence stand out, with 37.4% of the "doubly aggrieved" type, compared to 15.1% found in the study by Tamayo et al.

Table 2

Factor Analysis of Willingness to Use Violence

	Rotated component matrix	
	Component 1	Component 2
Would you personally be willing to use violence in the following situations?		
1. To defend your ideas or values	.673	.405
2. To defend your friends or family	.057	.814
3. Because of your political beliefs	.835	.136
4. To defend your rights	.399	.682
5. To defend your country	.516	.506
6. To defend your religion	.783	.156
7. To fight injustice	.241	.765

Subsequently, and following the strategy of Tamayo et al. (2021), we proceeded to the elaboration, with the data obtained in this study, of the typology of disposition to the use of violence. To this end, a dichotomisation of the variables generated from each Component has been carried out, establishing a score that assigns the cases to one of two categories (0 = Low; 1=High) based on the analysis of the distribution of each variable and the calculation of the contingency table. Table 3 shows the typology obtained, similar to the study by Tamayo et al. (2021), young people with a low socio-tropic disposition to violence are in the majority, although to a much lesser extent than that obtained by these authors (50.2% compared to 71.9% in the aforementioned study). In this study, the majority of young people with a high disposition (sociotropic and egocentric) to violence stand out, with 37.4% of the "doubly aggrieved" type, compared to 15.1% found in the study by Tamayo et al.

Table 3

Typology of disposition to violence among young people

Dimensions		Egocentric disposition to violence		
		Baja	High	Total
Provision dispositio to violence	Baja	Pacifists 32.9% (n=385)	Self-defensive 17.3% (n=202)	50.2% (n=587)
	High	Altruists 12.4% (n=145)	Double aggrieved 37.4% (n=438)	49.8% (n=583)
	Total	45.3% (n=530)	54.7% (n=640)	100% (n=1170)

As can be seen in Table 4, there are no statistically significant differences between the different types of risk of radicalisation and the students' perception of their *integration in the school*, which, according to the average, is quite high (the assessment ranges from 1=not at all integrated to 10=fully integrated).

Table 4

Differences in Radicalisation Risk Typologies according to the perception of integration in the centre.

N=1170							
Factor	Dependent Variable.	Media	DT	N	Post hoc	F Snedecor	Significance
Typology	<i>Integration Centre</i>					.263	.033
	D. Agrav.	7.72	2.007	385			
	Altruist	7.63	1.936	202			
	Self-def.	7.68	2.020	145			
	Pacifist	7.77	2.002	438			

p<.01**; p<.001***; p<.001***.

As can be seen in Table 5, there are significant appreciations with regard to the Relationship between teachers and pupils. As the comparison between groups (post hoc) shows, pupils of the "Pacifist" type show a significantly better relationship with the teaching staff than pupils of the "Doubly aggrieved" type. As far as the relationship between the pupils themselves is concerned, the different typologies do not show differences of significant interest.

Table 5

Differences in Radicalisation Risk Typologies according to the assessment of the relationship between teachers/students and students/students

N=1170							
Factor	V. Depend	Media	DT	N	Post hoc	F Snedecor	Significance
Typology	<i>Teacher/student ratio</i>					3.492	.015*
	D. Agrav.	6.76	2.138	385	4>1*		
	Altruist	6.99	1.851	202			
	Self-def.	7.00	1.810	145			
	Pacifist	7.19	1.774	438			
Typology	<i>Pupil/student ratio</i>					.482	.695
	D.Agrav	7.11	2.578	385			
	Altruist	7.27	2.583	202			
	Self-def.	7.34	2.514	145			
	Pacifist	7.29	2.429	438			

p<.05*; p<.01**; p<.001***; p<.001***.

Table 6 shows the opinion that the different types have of the perception of violence in the different environments of their daily lives. As the comparison between groups (Post hoc) shows in relation to the *Family Environment*, the "Altruistic" type perceives

significantly less violence in their family environment than the "Self-defensive" and "Double aggrieved" types (the values range from 1=not at all to 4=a lot). In the *Neighbourhood* variable, the differences also turn out to be statistically significant. Thus, it can be observed that the "Double aggrieved" have a greater perception of violence in the neighbourhood, which is only significant with the "Pacifist" type; however, the "Self-defensive" type only have a significantly greater perception of danger in the neighbourhood than the "Pacifist" and "Self-defensive" types. In the perception of violence in *leisure areas*, it can be seen that there are significant differences between the three types: the "Self-defensive" type perceives more danger than the "Altruistic" and "Pacifist" types. The last variable would be the *School Environment*, again, statistically significant differences can be observed between types: the "Self-defensive" type perceives more violence in the school environment than the "Altruistic" and "Pacifist" types.

Table 6

Differences in Radicalisation Risk Typologies according to the perception of violence in everyday environments: family, neighbourhood, leisure areas and school environment.

N=1170							
Factor	V. Depend	Media	DT	N	Post hoc	F Snedecor	Significance
Typology	<i>Family</i>					5.022	.002**
	D. Agrav.	1.43	.674	385			
	Altruist	1.25	.497	202	2<3,1		
	Self-def.	1.46	.727	145			
	Pacifist	1.33	.644	438			
Typology	<i>Neighbourhood</i>					9.269	.000***
	D. Agrav.	2.03	.797	385			
	Altruist	1.88	.834	202	1>4		
	Self-def.	2.17	.890	145	3>2,4		
	Pacifist	1.80	.793	438			
Typology	<i>Leisure areas</i>					4.030	.007**
	D. Agrav.	2.15	.909	385			
	Altruist	2.00	.864	202			
	Self-def.	2.30	.884	145			
	Pacifist	2.06	.881	438			
Typology	<i>School environment</i>					3.663	.012**
	D. Agrav.	2.12	.895	385			
	Altruist	1.99	.875	202			
	Self-def.	2.29	.912	145			
	Pacifist	2.06	.864	438			

p<.05*; p<.01**; p<.001***; p<.001***.

To conclude, Table 7 shows young people's opinions on how various casuistries may or may not affect the violent behaviour of young people. The first variable considered is *Drug use*; all four types of young people agree that drug use has a considerable influence on the violent behaviour of young people; in fact, it is the casuistry to which they attach most importance, with no differences in importance between the four types of young people. As for the next variable, *Suffering mistreatment*, it is the "Self-defensive" and "Pacifist" types who attach the greatest importance to this variable in influencing the violent behaviour of young people, more significantly ($p<.000^{***}$) than the "Doubly aggrieved" and "Altruistic" types, as can be seen in the comparison between groups or Post hoc. The influence of the *Person's Character* also shows significant differences ($p<.001^{***}$) between the "Self-defensive" and "Pacifist" types, who attach greater importance than the "Altruistic" type to the capacity that this trait can have on the violent behaviour of young people. In relation to the *Level of studies*, it is the "Double aggrieved" type who attach more importance to this variable and do so significantly compared to the "Pacifists" who attach less value to this variable when it comes to explaining the violent behaviour of young people. In relation to *Living Environment*, it is the "Self-defensive" type who attach the greatest importance to this variable and do so in a particularly significant way ($p<.000^{***}$) compared to the other three types. For the *economic situation* variable, the only differences, although very significant ($p<.000^{***}$), are between the "Double aggrieved" type, who attach more influence to the economic situation of the country on violence in young people than the "Pacifist" type, who are the ones who attach less importance to this variable. For the *Media* variable, significant differences only occur between the "Self-defensive" types, who attribute more influence on the violent behaviour of young people to the media than the "Altruistic" type.

Table 7

Differences in Radicalisation Risk Typologies according to perceptions of aspects that may influence young people's behaviour

N=1170 Factor	V. Depend	Media	DT	N	Post hoc	F Snedecor	Significance
Typology	<i>Drug use</i>					3.044	.068
	D. Agrav.	3.04	.922	383			
	Altruist	3.00	.936	202			
	Self-def.	3.21	.740	145			
	Pacifist	3.17	.841	438			
Typology	<i>Suffering abuse</i>					6.930	.000***
	D. Agrav.	2.87	.950	385			
	Altruist	2.85	.909	202	3,4>1		
	Self-def.	3.17	.782	145	3,4>2		
	Pacifist	3.06	.816	438			
Typology	<i>Personal character</i>					5.370	.001***
	D. Agrav.	2.78	.864	385			

Typology	Altruist	2.52	.865	202	3,1>2		
	Self-def.	2.86	.808	145			
	Pacifist	2.71	.854	438			
	<i>Level of education</i>					5.014	.002**
Typology	1.D. Agrav.	1.99	.995	385			
	2.Altruistic	1.84	.857	202	1>4		
	3.Self-defence.	1.77	.888	145			
	4.Pacifist	1.76	.885	438			
	<i>Living environment</i>					11.75	.000***
Typology	D. Agrav.	2.85	.952	385			
	Altruist	2.71	.950	202	3>2		
	Self-def.	3.29	.807	145	3>1,4		
	Pacifist	2.89	.915	438			
	<i>Situation Economic</i>					10.191	.000***
Typology	D. Agrav.	2.16	.935	385			
	Altruist	1.98	.881	202	1>4		
	Self-def.	1.97	.920	145			
	Pacifist	1.82	.841	438			
	<i>Media</i>					3.741	.011**
Typology	D. Agrav.	2.50	.985	385			
	Altruist	2.33	.932	202	3>2		
	Self-def.	2.68	.971	145			
	Pacifist	2.49	.956	438			

p<.05*; p<.01**; p<.001***; p<.001***.

Discussion and

Our working hypothesis, that the young people who most justify and defend violence are also those who perceive the most violence in their environment, is fulfilled with nuances as detailed below and in connection with the objectives of this work.

Based on the four subtypes of willingness to use violence and environmental factors that can influence this process of willingness to use violence, the findings that respond to the first objective of this study, to know how adolescents and young people justify violence, support the fact that acts of violence are promoted by individual motivations and interests that directly affect them, among the most important of which are the following

the profile of the "doubly aggrieved" as a group with a greater disposition to violence characterised by the use of two dimensions; on the one hand, the defence of family and friends and on the other hand the fight against injustices, coinciding with the results of studies, such as Tamayo et al. (2021); Almagro (2016); Lösel et al. (2018).

With regard to the second objective of the study, to establish which characteristics of the young people's environment play an important role in justifying and predisposing them to the use of violence, the family environment and their relationships in the

neighborhood stand out, where cultural elements and value systems can become factors that promote a predisposition towards violence. These factors will be linked to the characteristics of the people, the environment, as well as the subject's own perceptions, which coincides with the 5 levels of the studies conducted by Lösel et al. (2018), i.e. the individual level, the family level, the peer group level, the community level and the school level, which trigger the existence of factors that influence violence.

This suggests that a disposition to violence is an element that affects social relations and is one of the handicaps to overcome for integration and sociability in the educational and family context.

In terms of young people's opinions on the main causes for the predisposition to violence, the attributions are related to drug use, the economic situation, the level of studies or the influence of the media. All of them are related to the context and raise the importance of prevention through educational actions and a necessary interaction between the personal environment and public institutions.

It can thus be concluded that young people and adolescents justify the use of violence to defend their ideas as a reaction to different situations that are determined by the context (Neumann, 2013; Sageman, 2017). It should also be added that violent actions have increased with the growth of technological advances which, on the one hand, are tools with great potential for the dissemination of content and, on the other, are massively used by the younger population as a means of communication par excellence. Added to this is the problem of establishing a single meaning for what refers to behaviours or actions that lead to radicalisation and which do not (Almagro, 2016).

Faced with this situation, we defend the role that education should play as a fundamental tool for the prevention of radicalisation and any type of extremist violence. Even in the case of minors who have already committed crimes, educational measures have proven to be more rehabilitative than exclusively punitive ones (Lozano-Díaz et al., 2021). In this sense, we consider that the involvement of the educational context must become one of the fundamental scenarios for cohesion, prevention and detection of violence, which makes management teams and teachers essential in this process. To this end, we consider it essential to train teachers in strategies and resources to be developed in the classroom, as well as to strengthen the coexistence plans of the centres where training in the prevention of violence and its consequences is contemplated for adolescents and young people, promoting a culture of peace, through the work of empathy, emotions and respect for the diversity of cultures and values. The weight of issues such as political ideology refers to the need to train for democratic citizenship in educational centres (Wachs et al., 2022). From the legislative and political perspective, according to Tamayo et al. (2021), practical involvement should be oriented towards actions for the prevention of violence and radicalisation, developing actions with the aim of detecting attitudes and predispositions to violence, designing tools that enable the early detection of children and adolescents' propensity to violence and undertaking the development of instruments that serve to assess the risk of young people resorting to violence as a means to their ends.

Currently, the key role of the digital space is unavoidable and is placed as a central issue, training young people in the critical reading of social networks and the media

implies taking advantage of the potential of the digital through methodologies that involve the active commitment of students (Lozano-Díaz and Fernández-Prados, 2022).

Violence among young people and adolescents is increasingly visible in the media, where in our study we reflect the context as one of the triggering factors. However, there are some limitations that need to be addressed here. Regarding the design of the research project, our questionnaire was designed for a specific age group, and the data collection was limited geographically and temporally, we believe that comparative studies would provide interesting information. On the other hand, it would also be interesting to carry out research in a few years' time to find out to what extent the current situation of conflict in Europe (the war in Ukraine) may be influencing these data. Furthermore, in the socio-educational sphere, training programmes on the prevention of violent attitudes and radicalisation should be established between different educational and social institutions for adolescents.

In general terms, we believe that this study is an advance that reflects the knowledge of the factors that trigger the birth of violence among young people and adolescents in today's society and the risks of being immersed in processes of radicalisation. We consider it relevant for future lines of research to analyse the factors in this study in relation to the use of social networks as a medium that can facilitate and enhance violence and radicalisation among adolescents

Funding

This research was funded thanks to the project entitled "Effects of hate speech in the offline relationships of adolescents in the west of Almeria (DIS-ODIO)", financed by the Ministry of Science and Innovation (2021-2023).

Reference

- Almagro, I. (2016, noviembre 18). *El arte de la prevención y la des-radicalización*. Estudios de Política Exterior. <https://www.politicaexterior.com/el-arte-de-la-prevencion-y-la-des-radicalizacion/>
- Bazaga, I. y Tamayo, M. (2021). Radicalización violenta. *Eunomía. Revista en Cultura de la Legalidad*, 20, 322-333. <https://doi.org/10.20318/eunomia.2021.6079>
- Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into violent extremism I: a review of social science theories. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 4(4), 7-36. <https://doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.4.4.1>
- Casas, F. (2010). Representaciones sociales que influyen en las políticas sociales de infancia y adolescencia en Europa. *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 17, 15-28. https://doi.org/10.7179/psri_2010.17.02
- De La Corte, L. (2015). ¿Qué sabemos y qué ignoramos sobre la radicalización? En J. Antón-Mellón (Ed.), *Islamismo Yihadista: radicalización y contraradicalización* (pp. 37-52). Tirant lo Blanch.
- Doosje, B., Moghaddam, F. M., Kruglanski, A. W., de Wolf, A., Mann, L., y Feddes, A. R. (2016) Terrorism, radicalization and de-radicalization. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 11, 79–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2016.06.008>

- Enamorado, J. J. (2017). Reseña [Reseña del libro *En busca de una Estrategia de Seguridad Nacional*, de M. A. Ballesteros]. *Revista del Instituto Español de Estudios Estratégicos*, 9, 191-194. <https://revista.ieee.es/article/view/210/350>
- Frías, S. M. (2019). La violencia que se ejerce y que se padece en la familia de origen y en la infancia. En R. Castro (Ed.), *De parejas, hogares, instituciones y espacios comunitarios. Violencia contra mujeres en México* (ENDIREH 2016) (pp. 115-159). Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres y Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. <https://doi.org/10.22201/crim.9786073022064e.2019>
- Jahnke, S. Schroder, C. P., Goede L. R., Lehmann, L., Hauff, L., y Beelmann, A. (2020). Observer sensitivity and early radicalization to violence among young people in Germany. *Social Justice Research*, 33, 308-330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-020-00351-y>
- Jalloul, H. M. (2018). Realidad, ideología y terminología: entre la radicalización, la violencia política y el terrorismo yihadista. *Revista de Estudios en Seguridad Internacional*, 4(2), 99-121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18847/1.8.7>
- Lösel, F., King, S., Bender, D., y Jugl, I. (2018). Protective factors against extremism and violent radicalization: A systematic review of research. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 12(1-2), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.3233/DEV-170241>
- Lozano-Díaz, A., Chacón-Benavente, F., y Roith, C. (2021). Medidas educativas con menores infractores: el caso de Alemania y España. *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 37, 159-172. https://doi.org/10.7179/PSRI_2021.37.11
- Lozano-Díaz, A. y Fernández-Prados, J. S. (2022). Young digital citizenship in #FridaysForFuture. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 44(5), 447-468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2021.1929012>
- Massa, E. A. (2019). Retos en la lucha contra el terrorismo y la radicalización desde el respeto a los derechos humanos. *Revista Saber y Justicia*, 2(16), 43-56. <https://saberyjusticia.enj.org/index.php/SJ/article/view/40>
- Montero, A. I. (2018). Discursos europeos sobre la radicalización violenta de la juventud: reflexiones desde la educación social. *RES: Revista de Educación Social*, 27, 295-310. <http://www.eduso.net/res>
- McCauley, C. y Moskaleiko, S. (2008). Mechanisms of political radicalization: pathways toward terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20(3), 415-433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546550802073367>
- Neumann, P. R. (2013). The trouble with radicalization. *International affairs*, 89(4), 873-893. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12049>
- Nivette, A., Echelmeyer, L., Weerman, F., Elsner, M., y Ribeaud, D. (2021). Understanding Changes in Violent Extremist Attitudes During the Transition to Early Adulthood. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 38, 949-978. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-021-09522-9>
- Parrat-Dayán, S. (2012). *Como enfrentar a indisciplina na escola*. Editora Contexto.
- Sageman, M. (2017). *Turning to political violence: The emergence of terrorism*. University of Pennsylvania press. <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812293821>
- Schils, N. y Verhage, A. (2017.) Understanding how and why young people enter radical or violent extremist groups. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 11, a473. <https://doi.org/10.4119/ijcv-3084>

- Tamayo, M., Bazaga, I., y Bermejo, R. (2021). La radicalización violenta de los jóvenes un reto en la construcción de sociedades seguras: una propuesta de tipología y escala de jóvenes vulnerables a procesos de radicalización violenta. *Cuadernos de Gobierno y Administración Pública*, 8(2), 119-130. <https://doi.org/10.5209/cgap.78366>
- Trujillo, H., González-Cabrera, J., León, C., y Valenzuela, C. C. (2006). De la agresividad a la violencia terrorista. Historia de una patología psicosocial previsible (Parte I). *Psicología Conductual*, 14(2), 273-288.
- Unión Europea (Ed.) (2017). *The contribution of youth work as well as non-formal yinformal learning to fostering active citizenship and participation of young people in diverse and tolerant societies, preventing marginalisation and radicalisation potentially resulting in violent behaviour. A practical toolbox for youth workers y youth organisations and recommendations to policy makers. Results of the expert group set up under the European Union Work Plan for Youth for 2016-2018*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2766/32369>
- Wachs, S., Wettstein, A., Bilz, L., y Gámez-Guadix, M. (2022). Motivos del discurso de odio en la adolescencia y su relación con las normas sociales. *Comunicar*, 30(71), 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C71-2022-01>
- Waldmann, P. (2007). Is There a Culture of Violence in Colombia? *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 19(4), 593-609. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546550701626836>

Traducido con  DeepL

Date received: 12 October, 2023.

Review date: 7 November, 2023.

Date of acceptance: 2 September, 2024.