

a) Methodology.

Sample. Access to schools and students.

Time frame.

Response rates.

Collection of the questionnaires.

Changes in the instrument made by the Spanish team.

Context. Some questions about the school system in Spain.

b) Sample description.

Gender.

Age.

School grades.

Types (private-public-‘concerted’) and location of schools (rural-urban areas).

c) Findings.

Self-reported delinquent behaviour.

Factors related to / explaining self-reported delinquency.

Students’ experiences. Perceptions of attempts to prevent delinquent behaviour (especially focused on youth violence and substance use).

Factors related to / explaining students’ different appraisals of preventive approaches.

d) Discussion.

a) Methodology

Sample. Access to schools and students.

The approaching process consisted of three steps: a preliminary contact with the management team in every school (to obtain its approval for the request) and trying to choose private, public and concerted schools either in urban and rural areas –and also distributed in different areas around the city of Zaragoza; a second step for a meeting in which we had to explain them in detail the goals and methodology of the survey –also to find places and times to conduct the survey; and a third stage in which every student’s parents received a letter to explicitly deny their permission (so their children could answer to the questionnaire). We must stress the fact that a majority of schools and parents (one only parent denied his permission) kindly received the proposal and gave us their permission to carry on with the study –we thank them all for their kind collaboration. Only some of the ‘non-public’ contacted schools showed their reluctance to host our research. This is why 84.13% of the questionnaires (1.521) come from public, 6.64% (120) from private and 9.23% (167) from concerted schools¹.

Also note that some management teams (in Spanish: *equipos directivos*) showed a deep interest in getting some feedback from this school survey and invited us to visit the school to expose and discuss the results of the study with the scholar community during 2013.

Time frame.

January-april 2012.

Response rates.

From a gross sample of 1.808 questionnaires, the number of valid responses amounted to 1766 once the total collected was ‘cleaned up’ and the disposable questionnaires were taken out. This number shows a valid response rate of 97.67%.

Collection of the questionnaires.

The members of the Spanish YouPrev team visited the selected classrooms and conducted the survey among students in every school through three assistants specially engaged for this task.

Changes in the instrument made by the Spanish team.

The Spanish team didn’t modify any other item in the original questionnaire. No changes were made on it for the Spanish survey so the Spanish specifics in our sample and educational or social context could be clearly identified.

¹ See some questions about the Spanish School System below.

Context. Some questions about the school system in Spain².

Legal age for compulsory education is 16 years old and School dropout in the Spanish system³ is on top of the European data: the percentage of students who early dropped out education was 31.7% in 2004, 31.2% in 2009 and 28.4% in 2012 (EU-25's approx. average during those years: 15.6, 15 and 14%).

The approximate distribution of students in Spain is around 2/3 for public education and 1/3 for private schools –total amount of private schools: 4.986 (1.248 'totally private' and 3.738 concerted), although this proportion is changing in favour of the private sector⁴.

The new policies and structural changes recently applied by the Spanish governments have reduced the investment on public education system and transferred an important amount of its resources to the private/concerted institutions⁵. During the last 5 years, the growth of public founding for private education has reached 30%, showing a trend that could easily be reinforcing the social stratification though the educational policies instead of acting as a potentially efficient mean against social inequality.

In the opposite sense, the public budget for education has been reduced in 21.9% in 2012, from 0.9% of the total public spends to 0.7%. Education for 0-3 year old children has been taken out of the public system –although some kindergartens are provided by the city councils. Education is not compulsory until the age of 7 years.

The tendency to focus on urban areas and reduce the investment in rural schools (poorly populated) is also one of the main specifics related to the Spanish policies in the field of education. Budget cuts have recently considered rural schools as one of the areas to focus on – consequently, many rural schools have had to close and quit their activity.

² All these elements and many other problems have been clearly stressed by experts and professionals in the National Institutional Survey.

³ Two complete reports (among many others) in:

Faci Lucía, Fernando M. (2011). "El abandono escolar prematuro en España", in *Avances en Supervisión Educativa –Revista de la Asociación de Inspectores de Educación en España*. http://www.adide.org/revista/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=282&Itemid=70

Rojas, G. et al. (2011). "Influence of family factors in school drop-out: a study within a multicultural context", in *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, no.25, pp.1377-1402. http://www.investigacion-psicopedagogica.org/revista/articulos/25/english/Art_25_624.pdf

⁴ More data about segregation in the Spanish System: Fernández Enguita, M. (2008). "Escuela pública y privada en España: la segregación rampante", in *Profesorado. Revista de currículum y formación del profesorado*. <http://www.ugr.es/~recfpro/rev122ART3.pdf>

⁵ *Encuesta de financiación y gastos de la enseñanza privada* –report about Private Education Founding, by Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE), 2012. <http://www.ine.es/jaxi/menu.do?L=0&type=pcaxis&path=%2Ft13%2Fp122&file=inebase>

b) Sample description

Gender and age students

Table 1. Students' gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	male	867	49,1	49,2	49,2
	female	895	50,7	50,8	100,0
	Total	1762	99,8	100,0	
Missing	System	4	,2		
Total		1766	100,0		

Distribution in the Spanish population (2011): 49.40% male, 50.60 female.

Table 2. Students' age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	13	58	3,3	3,3	3,3
	14	438	24,8	24,9	28,2
	15	511	28,9	29,1	57,3
	16	527	29,8	30,0	87,3
	17	202	11,4	11,5	98,8
	18	19	1,1	1,1	99,9
	19	1	,1	,1	99,9
	20	1	,1	,1	100,0
	Total	1757	99,5	100,0	
Missing	System	9	,5		
Total		1766	100,0		

Average: 15.25 years old.

School grades.

Considered grades: the programmes and academic years including those ages under the Spanish juvenile justice system (14 to 18 years old) in two different groups:

First - Second Grade of Compulsory Secondary Education: 14-16 years old.

Second - High School and Professional Training: 16-18 years old.

Around 75% of respondents belong to the first group and 25% of questionnaires come from the second level⁶.

Types (private-public-'concerted') and location of schools (rural-urban areas).

As seen above, 84.13% of the questionnaires (1.521) come from public schools, 6.64% (120) from private ones and 9.23% (167) from concerted institutions.

As seen in the table above, urban respondents' ages are a bit younger.

Urban respondents: **77.46%**⁷. Average: 15.12 years old.

Rural respondents: **22.54%**⁸. Average: 15.71 years old.

100% of rural data come from public schools (almost all schools in the rural areas are public in Aragón).

15% of urban respondents and 13.9% of rural respondents were born abroad.

⁶ Most of the teachers and management teams were quite reluctant to give us their permission to conduct the survey among young people in their two last scholar years because of their busy timetables.

⁷ 50% population in Aragón lives in the city of Zaragoza.

⁸ Selected schools in rural areas host children coming from medium and small villages.

Table 3. Students sample - rural/urban distribution⁹

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
urban	Valid	13	58	4,2	4,3
		14	377	27,5	27,7
		15	427	31,2	31,4
		16	363	26,5	26,7
		17	119	8,7	8,7
		18	15	1,1	1,1
		19	1	,1	,1
		20	1	,1	,1
		Total	1361	99,4	100,0
	Missing	System	8	,6	
	Total	1369	100,0		
rural	Valid	14	61	15,4	15,4
		15	84	21,2	21,2
		16	164	41,3	41,4
		17	83	20,9	21,0
		18	4	1,0	1,0
		Total	396	99,7	100,0
	Missing	System	1	,3	
		Total	397	100,0	

Some other specifics.

Table 4. Place of birth/mother tongues

		male	female
born in Spain	85.3%	86.2%	84.3%
born abroad	14.7%	13.8%	15.7
born abroad but raised in Spain¹⁰	6.20%		
recently arrived	8.50%		
Spanish-speaking families	92.9%		
Other languages at home	7.1%		

Countries of origin of foreign students:

Rumania 24.50% (3.6% total). Ecuador 21.1% (3.1% total). Morocco 12.30% (1.9% total). Colombia 4.10% (0.6% total). Peru 4.10% (0.6% total). Argentina 3.40% (0.5% total). China 2.04% (0.3% total)

Data about country of origin of participants' mothers and fathers are virtually identical to the info above.

Native languages:

Rumanian 43.65% (3.1% total). Arabic 20.63% (1.5%). French 10% (0.8%). Moroccan 5.55% (0.4%).

Family/ social context.

Table 5. Familiar context of students

		urban	rural	Spanish	foreign
with their (step)mothers	96.4%	96.7%	96.3%		
with their (step)fathers	87.4%	86.7%	89.6%		
with their brother(s)	44.6%				
with their sister(s)	36.8%				
with their grandparent(s)	4.6%	3.5%	8.6%	5.1%	2.0%
other relatives	1.3%				
foster family	1.1%			0.4%	5.5%
"others"	0.2%				

"Others": with my father when it's his turn 0,1% - 2 mothers 0,1% - boyfriend 0,1% - tutor 0,1%.

⁹ Spanish rural population: 20%. Rural population in Aragón: 35% –approx. rates.

¹⁰ Raised in Spain: under or 7 years old on arrival / recently arrived: 7 to 16 years old on arrival. 6-7 years old is the starting age for Primary (compulsory) School in the Spanish system.

Employment.

Total (including “sometimes” average, linked to temporary unemployment) = 77.7%.
84.1% of fathers and 71.4% of mothers are employed.

Total unemployment approx. average = 22.3% (unemployment index in 2012 = 24%).
17% of fathers and 8.5% of mothers run their own business.
0.2% of fathers and 15.8% of mothers work at home only –“look after home”¹¹.

Table 6. Unemployment rates of students’ parents

		urban	rural	Spanish	foreign
Fathers’ unemployment rates	15.9%	15.1% 12.5%	18.9% 15.7%	12.2% 10.8%	38.1% 27.2%
Mothers’ unemployment rates	28.6%	25.1% 18.9%	40.8% 32.2%	27% 21%	38.5% 27.2%

Table 7. Students' monetary position

		urban	rural	Spanish	foreign
“more money than others”	20.4%	21.6%	16.3%	21.1%	16.0%
“the same as others”	62.2%	62.1%	62.5%	64.7%	48.0%
“less money than others”	17.4%	16.3%	21.2%	14.2%	35.9%

Relationship with their parents.

Groups: [“almost always” + “often”] vs. [“seldom” + “almost never”]¹².

All items related to the relationship between parents and sons/daughters show lower values in older respondents’ statements –the older the students are, the lower rates are shown in their answers.

Foreign children seem to get emotional support in a lower proportion and in a higher proportion are not getting along with their father.

Table 8. Relationship with their parents

		male	female ¹³	Spanish	foreign
getting along with their fathers	87.3%	89.8%	85.0%		
get along with their mothers	92.2%	92.8%	91.9%		
not getting along with their fathers	7.9%			6.8%	14.3%
not getting along with their mothers	4.2%			4.1%	4.3%
easily get emotional support and care	95.5%			96.2%	91.6%
don’t get emotional support and care	1.7%				
would feel bad disappointing their parents	70%				
wouldn’t feel bad disappointing their parents	9.9%				

On parental control on table 9 we could say in a very synthetic way:

Children say where, but parents don’t know.

Children don’t tell who, but parents know about their children’s friends.

Parents know where children are and ask about what they do, but they don’t know it.

The younger respondents are, the earlier is the curfew and the more they have to phone home.

Control on female respondents is also higher.

Control on foreign children is lower.

¹¹ Note that (and mind the irony in the way how this statement is included) “0.5% of male respondents’ fathers look after home but 0% of female respondents’ fathers do it”.

¹² Along the whole questionnaire, all responses with these 4 variables are summed up and divided in two (“yes” and “no”/ “agree” and “disagree”).

¹³ Curiously the percentage of young girls getting along with their mother/father is under the male rates. It's something stressed by mothers today. Maybe a rebel character in adolescent female youngster.

Table 9. Parental control on students

		male	female	Spanish	foreign
I tell my parents where I am most afternoons after school	79%				
I don't tell them	9.7%			8.8%	14.6%
my parents know where I am are when I go out	74.6%				
They don't know it	6.9%			6.4%	9.8%
I tell my parents what friends I go out with	68.1%				
I don't tell them	9.5%				
my parents know what friends I go out with	79.7%	76.4%	83.1%		
they don't know it	5.1%			3.8%	12.4%
my parents know what I am doing	57.7%				
they don't know it	16%			15.4%	19.6%
I tell my parents what I do with my free time	60.2%				
I don't tell them	16.9%			15.2%	27.7%
I tell my parents how I spend my money	56%				
I don't tell them	22.3%				
my parents ask me about what I did and with whom	70.4%	67.1%	73.7%		
my parents don't ask	10.6%				
I am given a curfew	79.5%	74.1%	84.6%	72.7%	67.7%
my parents don't give me any curfew	13.2%				
I have to phone home when I am out late	71.5%	64.7%	78.1%	72.2%	67.7%
I don't have to phone	13.8%				
my parents check if I did my homework	82.8%				
my parents don't check it	6.8%				
my parents check if films are allowed to my age group	23%	19.3%	26.6%		
they don't control it	62.6%			65.2%	47%

Relationship with school.

As a general trend, the average of rates collected from young students' responses is higher in all items: the self-reported relationship between students and school gets worse as respondents grow older (some exceptions below) and most positive attitudes about school are shown by young girls and foreign students.

Table 10. Relationship with school

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
I would miss my school if I'd have to move	80.4%	75.7%	84.9%			81.1%	77.7%		
I wouldn't	19.7%								
I like my school	67.5% ¹⁴	59.7%	75%	66.7%	72.2%	66.4%	71.5%		
I don't like it	32.5%								
I like going to school most mornings	49.4%,	41.3%	57.3%	46.7%	65%				
I don't	50.6%								
I think that classes are interesting	52.7%	50.4%	54.9%	50.8%	64.5%	51.3%	57.6%	53.2%	58.6%
I don't	47.3%								
I'm above average in school	57.1%	54.7%	59.5%	59.6%	42.6%	56.7%	58.6%		
I am average	30.8%	31.6%	30%	28.8%	22.5%	31.3%	29%		
I'm below average	21.1%	13.8%	10.5%	11.6%	15.1%				
I have skipped classes without excuse¹⁵	22.8%	27.2%	18.5%	20.8%	34.1% ¹⁶	21.9%	25.8%	12%	35.6%

¹⁴ Is it incoherent with previous statement? Might this be due to the fact that they would actually miss their school because of their friends and classmates but they don't really like the school itself?

¹⁵ When asked about how often, the results are: once (4.4%), twice (5.7%), 3 (2.4%), 4 (1.0%), 5 (1.5%), 6 (0.3%), 7 (0.5%), 8 (0.2%)... 9 times or more (frequently) = 6.8%.

¹⁶ Although foreign students state a more positive attitude towards school.

c) Findings.

Students' appraisals and experiences at school.

Girls generally point out positive statements about school. In contrast, boys tend to stress the negative ones. In general terms, foreign students also point out the positive specifics of school more than the negative ones. Also note the high perception about drug selling and vandalising in rural areas.

Table 11. Students' appraisals and experiences at school.

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
there is a lot of drug use	51%	54.8%	48.6%	53.3%	41.6%	48.1%	63.3%	42.7%	53.8%
many things are broken/vandalized	43.8%	45.3%	42.2%	45.6%	32.9%	40.2%	56.2%	47.2%	36%
there is a lot of stealing	35.7%	33.9%	37.4%	36.1%	33.5%	37.7%	28.9%	47%	25.3%
there is a lot of fighting	28.6%	26.8%	30.4%	30%	28.5%	29.8%	24.7%	36.6%	19.6%
there are activities for those who don't go well	77.5%	74.6%	80.1%	76.9%	80.4%	76.2%	81.8%	¹⁷	
school organizes and gives us information on topics	76.7% ¹⁸	73.5%	79.8%			75.1%	82%	¹⁹	
teachers and parents talk to each other about things that affect us at school	74.5%	72.2%	76.7%	73.7%	79.3%	74.9%	73.2%		
teachers are aware of any problem that might happen	68.6%	65.6%	71.6%	67.2%	76.9%	69.3%	66%		
the school tries to solve the problems we have in school	65.6%	61.5%	69.8%	64.7%	71.4%	63.3%	66.3%		

Students' appraisals and experiences in their neighbourhoods.

As we might expect, students from rural areas seem to be involved in more positive and safe communities. In the opposite direction (see below), signs of insecurity are mainly stressed by males and located in urban areas. Female stress positive aspects of neighbourhoods. But in a contrary sense, male students define their neighbourhoods as safe and spaces where people can be trusted.

¹⁷ Higher rates from younger respondents –here and below.

¹⁸ Which one was most important to you? Sexuality (26.9%). Drugs-alcohol (26%). Violence-conflicts-bullying (13.1%). Traffic safety (1.8%). Internet (0.8%).

¹⁹ Higher rate = 83.6% from 15 year old respondents –vs. 71-74% from other ages, which might be due to a concrete section of the sample, depending on where, how and by whom has the questionnaire been filled.

Table 12. Students' appraisals and experiences in their neighbourhoods

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
my neighbourhood is safe	78.4%	79%	77.7%	79.1%	73.5%	75.2%	89%		
my neighbours generally get along well with each other	75.2%			76%	70.7%	72.1%	85.7%		
I am known among my neighbours	69.9%			71.3%	62.3%	64.8%	87.4%		
people in my neighbourhood can be trusted	68.7%	69.7%	67.7%	70.3%	59.1%	65.8%	78.5%	²⁰	
there are places and activities for young people	62.9%	61%	64.8%	62.4%	65.9%	70.8%	35.8%	²¹	
my neighbours are willing to help each other	59%	57.9%	60.1%			55.6%	70.5%	²²	
I live in a close-knit neighbourhood	39.5%			38.9%	42.6%	35.8%	51.9%		
people do things together	39.2%	40.5%	37.8%			36%	50%		
there is a lot of police patrolling	35.8%	38.6%	33%	33.9%	47.4%	39.7%	22.6%		²³
there is a lot of graffiti	34.2%	38.3%	30.1%			11.5% ²⁴	40.8%		
there is a lot of drug selling	31.2%	35.7%	26.5%	32.1%	25.1%	35.8%	15.6%	²⁵	
there is a lot of fighting	20.5%	22.2%	18.8%			24.9%	5.6%		
there is a lot of crime	19.1%	22%	16.1%	19.9%	14%	23.2%	4.9%		
there are lots of empty/abandoned buildings	11.7%	13.7%	9.6%			12.2%	10%		

Friends/ family/ social environment/ behaviour patterns.

Foreign students go out more often than the Spanish ones, but Spanish youngsters drink more alcoholic drinks than their foreign colleagues. The amount of foreign children who never got engaged in fights or in drug consumption habits is lower than their Spanish mates' numbers, but when speaking about 'often', that proportion is higher than in Spanish colleagues.

In rural areas the proportion of children who never goes to bars is higher than in urban context. But the proportion of students never having had alcoholic drinks is higher in urban than in urban context.

In a similar way, the proportion of children annoying people for fun or engaging in fights is higher in rural context.

²⁰ Higher rates from younger respondents.

²¹ Higher rates from younger respondents.

²² Higher rates from younger respondents.

²³ Higher rates are registered among *older* respondents –16 and more.

²⁴ These data are curious considering that graffiti is mostly considered a urban phenomenon –as remarked in the interviews.

²⁵ Lower rates from younger respondents.

Table 13. Students' activities in spare time

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
I go out once a week	38.6%			40%	30.7%				
I go twice a week	28.8%			30.5%	18.7%				
I go out 3 times a week or more ²⁶	17.8%			16.7%	24.1%				
I don't go out in the evenings	14.8%			12.9%	26.5%				
studying for school or do homework ²⁷	96.8%	47.8	72.4%						²⁸
hanging out in shopping centres, streets, parks or neighbourhood just for fun ²⁹	91.5%	37.7%	54.2%			49.7%	33.1%		
sports, athletics or exercise ³⁰	90.9%			61%	38.8%				
going to bars, discos or pop concerts	75.5%	94.6%	87.4%	24.6% <i>often</i> 23.2% <i>never</i>	15.3% <i>often</i> 39.2% <i>never</i>	16.5% <i>often</i> 29.5% <i>never</i>	11.7% <i>often</i> 46.7% <i>never</i>	8.3% <i>often</i>	³¹
having beer or other alcoholic drinks	61.7% ³²	21.5% <i>often</i> 40.8% <i>never</i>	17.4% <i>often</i> 35.8% <i>never</i>	20.5% <i>often</i> 36% <i>never</i>	12.3% <i>often</i> 52.6% <i>never</i>	17.1% <i>often</i> 42% <i>never</i>	27.3% <i>often</i> 25.8% <i>never</i>	36.2% <i>stms/often</i>	
something forbidden for fun	42.1%	51% <i>never</i> 10.1% <i>often</i>	64.7% <i>never</i> 6.1% <i>often</i>	57% <i>never</i> 8.1% <i>often</i>	64.2% <i>never</i> 7.9% <i>often</i>				
something creative	39% ³³	67.9%	54.1%	60% <i>never</i> 14.3% <i>often</i>	66% <i>never</i> 10.7% <i>often</i>	61.7% <i>never</i>	58.5% <i>never</i>		
frightening or annoying other people just for fun	19.2% ³⁴	25.8%	12.8%			18.1%	23%		
engaging in fights	15% ³⁵	21.9%	8.2%	86.9% <i>never</i> 1.4% <i>often</i>	73.6% <i>never</i> 5.1% <i>often</i>	86.6% <i>never</i> 13.4% <i>stms/often</i>	79.3% <i>never</i> 20.7% <i>stms/often</i>		
taking drugs	14.7% ³⁶	82% <i>never</i> 5.6% <i>often</i>	88.7% <i>never</i> 3.3% <i>often</i>	84.7% <i>never</i> 4.4% <i>often</i>	89.3% <i>never</i> 4.8% <i>often</i>			6.5%	18.5% ³⁷

²⁶ 2.3% say they go out every day of the week.

²⁷ 60.4% say they do it "often" and 91.8% do it always alone. Never: 1% female vs. 5.5% male.

²⁸ Worst rates for older respondents.

²⁹ Higher rates for younger respondents. 96.5% of them do it with friends. Never: 7.6% urban vs. 11.5% rural; 4.7% female vs.: 12.3% male.

³⁰ Higher rates for younger respondents. 81% do it with friends. Never: 8.6% Spanish vs. 12.2% foreigners.

³¹ Higher rates for older respondents.

³² 97.3% of them with friends and 5.1% alone.

³³ 93.3% of them with friends. 54.1% on the total sample do it alone. Higher rates for older respondents.

³⁴ 83.9% of them with friends and 21.6% alone.

³⁵ 72.4% of them with friends.

³⁶ 86.8% of them with friends and 18.8% alone.

³⁷ 14% of 15 year old students and 21.5% of 16 year old ones take drugs "sometimes" or "often".

In spite of the information given by the data above (referring to how important friends are and what is their role in respondents' attitudes and habits). Remark the fact that 43.8% of students feel that the opinion of their friends is unimportant. We should stress the fact that 13,2% of our students feel unhappy. This feeling is stronger among foreign students.

Table 14. Students' feeling

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
what my friends think of me is unimportant or rather unimportant	43.8% ³⁸	51.7%	36.1%	41.2%	59.4%	40.8%	54.1%		
I felt happy or very happy most of the last six months	86.7%			69.7% <i>just happy</i>	55.8% <i>just happy</i>				
I felt a bit unhappy, unhappy or very unhappy	13.2%			12%	20.4%				

A big gap is shown between stealing and using weed or hash (the majority of youngsters have friends who did both things) and the rest of acts/behaviours. As expected in rural areas more students have friends having 'bad behaviours', maybe because in rural areas everybody knows everybody, and in rural areas people is in touch with similar conditions people.

Table 15. Friends' behaviours

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
use weed or hash	75.5%	79.1%	72.1%	77.4%	64.7%	72.5%	85.9%	58.7%	86.3%
steal things from a shop or dept. store	61.8%	66.3%	57.5%	65.2%	41.7%	61.6%	62.3%	58.7%	65.4%
use ecstasy, speed, heroin or coke	29.6%	30.9%	28.3%	30.6%	23.4%	26.2%	41.3%	15.9%	46.6%
threaten somebody with a weapon or threaten to beat them up	16.6%	18.4%	14.7%			18.6%	9.6%		
beat someone up or hurt someone badly with something like a stick or a knife	14.7%	15.5%	14%			14.3%	16.2%	10.4%	17.4%
enter a building without permission to steal something	6.8%	9.6%	4.2%	7.2%	4.3%	6.5%	7.9%	4.5%	8.3%

³⁸ Which seems incoherent with the statements considering friends as the main factor to prevent forbidden acts committed by youngsters themselves. Higher rates for older respondents.

Values/ attitudes.

Listed order: highest to lowest rates to show the importance given by students to concrete behaviours. High rates (including “wrong” or very wrong”) are generally for younger (14 or under) groups’ opinions. The majority of responses show a general consensus on the “worst” or more serious attitudes, regardless of the differences between sexes/ countries origin/ ages or locations. A big gap is shown between those acts (above) seen as wrong by a majority of respondents and the “not so wrong” behaviours (below). As we might have expected, downloading films/music is considered a wrong act by a small minority.

Table 14. Students’ opinions on wrong acts and attitudes

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
breaking into a building to steal something is wrong	98.7%	98.3%	99.1%			99%	97.5%		
<i>not wrong at all</i>	0.5%								
humiliating, hitting or threatening my boyfriend/girlfriend is wrong	98.7%			99% (94.2% very wr.)	97.3% (88.3% very wr.)				
<i>not wrong at all</i>	0.6%								
using a weapon or forcing someone to get their money or things is wrong	98.6%	97.9%	99.4%	98.9%	97.3%				
<i>not wrong at all</i>	0.6%								
humiliating, hitting or threatening someone for fun at school is wrong	97.7%	96.4%	99.1%	97.6%	98.4%	97.9%	97%		
<i>not wrong at all</i>	0.5%								
hitting someone to hurt him/her is wrong	96.6%	94.7%	98.7%						
<i>not wrong at all</i>	1%								
knowingly insulting people because of their religion etc. is wrong	96.5%	94.6%	98.3%	96.2%	98.1%	97.8%	91.9%	84.7%	75.9%
<i>not wrong at all</i>	1.3%								
destroying or damaging someone else’s property on purpose is wrong	94%	91.1%	97%	93.7%	95.7%	94.4%	92.9%		
<i>not wrong at all</i>	1%								
lying, disobeying or talking back to adults is wrong	70.7%	73.4%	68%	69.2%	78.8%	69.9%	73.4%		
<i>not wrong at all</i>	2.8%								
stealing something small from a shop is wrong	59.8%	57.9%	61.8%	57.5%	73.3%	59.1%	62.1%		
<i>not wrong at all</i>	8.5%								
illegally downloading films or music is wrong	10.5%	9.2%	11.9%	7.7%	27%	9.9%	12.7%	15.6% (highest rate) ³⁹	
<i>not wrong at all</i>	62%								

³⁹ Average of the rest: 8.7%.

Some remarkable statements:

Only “fully agrees” + “somewhat agrees” results are included in the tables.

As we could expect, main differences between ages are located in questions referring to sexist violence and guns. Respondents over 16 show their highest agreement in those items: higher “sexism and violence” rates belong to older respondents (mainly boys much further than girls, foreigners more than Spanish and rural areas over urban ones). Nevertheless, we must note that respect to authority, not only (but also) related to violence or abuse, is also higher among rural and foreign students.

Table 15. Students’ values on violence

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
real men have to be strong and protect their families	62.1%	65.6%	58.6%	59.4%	77.8%	61%	65.8%		
a man must be prepared to protect his family with violence	18.1%	29%	7.7%	17.4%	22.4%	17.9%	19%		
men should be allowed to have a gun for self-defence	15.8%	24.9%	6.9%	14.6%	22%	15.4%	16.8%		
think that women and children must obey men	9.3%	14.3%	4.4%	7.5%	20.2%	8.5%	12%		
men must use violence when someone talks badly about his family	9.1%	14.9%	3.4%	7.9%	16.1%	8.2%	12.5%		
men who don’t answer insults with violence are cowards	6.7%	10.5%	2.9%	5.9%	11.1%	5.7%	10.2%		
fathers may use violence as heads of their families	2.3%	3.7%	0.8%	1.9%	4.7%	1.9%	3.6%		
a man may beat his wife if she cheats on him	1.3%	1.9%	0.7%	1%	3.1%	1%	2.5%		

On individual vital attitudes reflected on table 16, we have considered just integrated answers –“fully agrees” + “somewhat agrees”.

Short-run reasoning (45.1%) and non-reflexive behaviours (34.5%) are quite common among respondents. In Group Discussion 2 this attitudes have been very clear amongst youngsters. More than 25% of them say they find risk is fun and less than 20% do not mind how their acts affect others, even if they are aware of the consequences. Higher percentages are found among male respondents over 16 years old and in rural areas.

Table 16. Individual attitudes among students

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
I am more concerned with the short run than the long run	45.1%	45.9%	44.2%	44.2%	49.8%	43.9%	49.1%	38%	52.5%
I act on the spur of the moment without thinking	34.5%	35.2%	33.9%			33.1%	39.4%	29%	39.2%
I like to test myself by doing something risky	26.8%	36.1%	17.9%	25.9%	32.3%	25.8%	30.3%	23.8%	31.1%
I sometimes take a risk just for the fun of it	26%	35.2%	16.8%	26.4%	23.5%	25.1%	28.9%	22.2%	26.4%
I do what gives me pleasure	21.5%	23.9%	19.3%			19.9%	27.1%	14.8%	29.5%
I prefer excitement and adventure to security	20.8%	29.3%	12.5%			20.2%	22.7%	17.8%	22%
if my acts upset people this is people's problem and not mine	19.9%	21.2%	18.8%			18.4%	25.1%	18.1%	20.5%
I look for myself first even if it makes things difficult for the rest	17.2%	21.1%	13.4%			15.8%	22.3%	14.1%	23.6%
I try to get what I want even if this causes problems to people	12.8%	15.3%	10.3%	13.3%	10.2%	11.7%	16.7%	10.1%	17.8%

Victimization.

A low sense of victimization between young people must be noted, mainly located in urban areas. Most of those typical victimizing acts are thefts or petty thefts. The use of technologies is increasing as a way of bothering/harassing among peers (mainly girls, younger than 16 and in urban areas).

Although the rest of acts show a low grade of victimization, note that the highest collected rates on victimisation are: foreign-urban-male for theft (non-violent), urban-spanish for robbery (violence-intimidation), younger-urban-female for harassing-abuse, older-foreign-male for discrimination, urban-foreign-female for girl/boyfriend mistreating.

Table 17. Real victimisation by students in their lifetimes

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
had something stolen ⁴⁰	31.4%	32.5%	30.4%	30.9%	34.1%	32.7%	26.8%		
been wanted to give someone their money or something else ⁴¹	15.6%			16.8%	8.3%	19.5%	2%		
been teased in a hurtful way or somebody made fun through e-mail etc ⁴²	8.6%	6%	11%			9.4%	5.6%	11% ⁴³	
suffered threats or physical violence because of my religion etc ⁴⁴	2.9%	3.2%	2.4%	1.8%	8.9%	3%	2.6%		6.1% ⁴⁵
been violently hit or hurt by someone and needed to see the doctor ⁴⁶	2.8%					3%	2.3%		
been badly treated or humiliated by my girlfriend/boyfriend ⁴⁷	2.6%	2.4%	2.7%	2.3%	4%	2.7%	2%		

Self-reported delinquent behaviour.

As we could expect, all rates collected from young respondents (14 y-o or under) are far below the average. As expected too, delinquent behaviours included in the list are mostly carried out by men. Most outstanding results are: a) downloading music or films on internet is the closest one to the general average; b) stealing things from a shop (once or twice) is something usual (around 25% of the young population) between young men in urban areas; c) 18% painted in train, walls, etc –mainly males in rural areas, surprisingly; d) 14,2% participate in group fights –mainly foreigners and youngsters living in rural areas; e) nearly 10% of the population sold or helped someone else selling drugs –more usual in rural areas; f) minority but also surprising, 1,7% of young people carried a gun mainly young men and in rural areas –possible mistake: not distinguishing gun from shotgun, very commonly used in rural areas.

⁴⁰ Last 12 months: 1 - 17.1%. 2 - 0.1%. 3 - 1.2%. 4 - 0.5%. 5 - 0.3%. 6 - 0.1%. 7 - 0.1%. 8 - 0.1%. "lots" - 0.2%. "few" - 0.1%. "some" - 0.1%.

⁴¹ Last 12 months: 1 - 7.47%. 2 - 2.38%. 3 - 0.48%. 4 - 0.05%. 5 - 0.17%. 6 - 0.05%. "I don't know" - 0.05%.

⁴² Last 12 months: 1 - 2.6%. 2 - 1.7%. 3 - 0.6%. 4 - 0.2%. 6 - 0.1%. 7 - 0.1%. 10 - 0.2%. 24 - 0.1%.

⁴³ Higher rate (for younger respondents (14 y-o or under). Others' average: 7%.

⁴⁴ Last 12 months: 1- 0.7%. 2- 0.3%. 3 - 0.2%. 4 - 0.1%. 5 - 0.2%. "Some"/"a few" - 0.3%. "Several"/"many"/"hundreds" - 0.4%.

⁴⁵ Higher rate for older respondents (over 16). Others' average: 2.5%.

⁴⁶ Last 12 months: 1 - 1.5%. 2 - 0.3%. 3 - 0.1%. 10 - 0.1%. 80 - 0.1%. No origin or sex differences.

⁴⁷ Last 12 months: 1 - 1.2%. 2 - 0.4%. 3 - 0.2%. 4 - 0.2%. 6 - 0.1%. 10 - 0.1%. "some" - 0.2%.

Table 18. On illegal acts committed by students

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
illegally downloaded music or films from the internet ⁴⁸	88.4%	89.7%	87.1%	91.4%	70.9%				
stolen something from a shop or store ⁴⁹	22.4%	25.4%	19.5%	23.6%	15.4%	23.1%	19.9%		
painted on a wall, train or bus ⁵⁰	18%	22.9%	13.2%			17.1%	21%		
taken part in a group fight in a football stadium, on the street or other public space ⁵¹	14.2%	20.4%	8.2%	13%	20.9%	13.4%	17.2%		
sold or helped someone selling drugs ⁵²	9.5%	13.3%	5.8%	10%	6.6%	8.8%	11.9%		
stolen something from a person ⁵³	8.9%	10.9%	7.1%	9.4%	6.6%	9.2%	8.1%		
damaged something on purpose ⁵⁴	8%	13.1%	3.1%	8.4%	6.2%	6.3%	13.9%		
carried a weapon or an object that could be used as a weapon, such as a stick, knife or chain ⁵⁵	3.9%			3.9%	4.3%	3.7%	4.8%		
stolen something off from a car ⁵⁶	2.1%	3.5%	0.7%			1.5%	3.8%		
stolen a bicycle ⁵⁷	1.8%	3.2%	0.3%			1.8%	1.5%		
threatened someone or committed physical violence because of their religion etc ⁵⁸	1.8%	2.5%	1%	1.8%	1.5%	1.1%	4%		
carried a gun ⁵⁹	1.7%	3.3%	0.2%			1.5%	2.5%		
broken into a building to steal something ⁶⁰	1.3%	2%	0.7%	1.4%	0.8%	12%	1.5%		
stolen a motorbike or car ⁶¹	1.1%	2%	0.3%	1.3%	0.4%				
intentionally hurt or beat someone up with a stick or knife and injured them ⁶²	1.1%	1.9%	0.4%	0.9%	2.7%	0.9%	2%		
used a weapon, forced or threatened someone to get money or things ⁶³	0.6%	1.3%	0%			0.6%	0.8%		

⁴⁸ Last 12 months: “frequently” - 901 (51%). Most of participants normally practice this activity.

⁴⁹ Last 12 months: 1 - 104. 2 - 76. 3 - 38. 4 - 17. 5 or more – 61.

⁵⁰ Last 12 months: 1 - 96. 2 - 64. 3 - 26. 4 - 11. 5 or more – 34.

⁵¹ Last 12 months: 1 - 79. 2 - 54. 3 - 17. 4 - 6. 5 or more – 23.

⁵² Last 12 months: 1 - 25. 2 - 23. 3 - 14. 4 - 3. 5 or more – 64.

⁵³ Last 12 months: 1 - 45. 2 - 24. 3 - 20. 4 - 3. 5 or more – 14.

⁵⁴ Last 12 months: 1 - 50. 2 - 34. 3 - 10. 5 or more – 11.

⁵⁵ Last 12 months: 1 - 13. 2 - 10. 3 - 8. 4 - 3. 5 or more – 12.

⁵⁶ Last 12 months: 1 - 14. 2 - 6. 3 - 2. 7 - 2. “I don’t know” - 1.

⁵⁷ Last 12 months: 1 - 13. 2 - 3. 3 - 1. 4 - 1. 5 or more – 3.

⁵⁸ Last 12 months: 1 - 4. 2 - 2. 3 - 1. “Few” - 2. 5 or more – 8.

⁵⁹ Last 12 months: 1 - 8. 2 - 4. 3 - 2. 4 - 1. 10 or more – 4.

⁶⁰ Last 12 months: 1 - 6. 2 - 3. 3 - 1. 5 - 1. 17 - 1.

⁶¹ Last 12 months: 1 - 7. 2 - 3. 4 - 1. 10 - 3.

⁶² Last 12 months: 1 - 7. 5 or more - 5.

⁶³ Last 12 months: 1 - 1. 2 - 1. 3 - 3.

211 respondents (**12%** sample) have had **contact with the police** for something illegal they did. Around 50% of contacts were related to vandalism or alcohol or drugs –consumption or selling, no other specification.

How often has it happened?

1 - 120. 2 - 32. 3 - 14. 4 - 2. 5 or more – 11.

The last time, because of **which offence?**

55 - Vandalism/ damage to things/ public space/ against ‘civic norms’.

49 - Alcohol or other drugs.

27 - Against property (entering houses, stealing cars, shoplifting, robbery).

18 - Directly related to conflicts with the police (registers, aggressions, riots).

17 - Aggression/ fighting/ threatening.

8 - Related to traffic laws.

4 - “Nothing”, “standing still”.

2 - Carrying a weapon (knife, “knife in a keychain”).

1 - Conflicts with teachers.

1 - Hacking.

Consequences of this contact with the police:

-80 students’ parents (4.5 sample and 38% contacts) were notified about the incident and 42 of them (52.5%), punished their son/daughter (2.45% sample and 20% contacts).

-Teachers were only notified in 6 occasions (0.3% sample and 2.84% contacts).

-13 respondents (0.7% sample and 6.16% contacts) were sent to a court or a prosecutor and only 1 was punished by them.

-103 cases ended without any consequence: “nothing happened” for 48.81% contacts (5.8% sample).

Most of answers make us think that students are talking about incivilities, faults or misdeeds more than “proper” crimes in a strict legal sense. So, extra-judicial measures also seem to be working at the level of the police. Note that the role of the parents is shown as a secondary element, and teachers’ is even less relevant.

Something **else** happened the last time participant had contact with the police:

“They took me to the police station/ they took my data”, “I got fined/ denounced” ... 18.

“I ran away”, “they didn’t catch me” ... 3. “They let us go”, “They didn’t do anything” ... 3.

“The police called my parents” ... 1. “They didn’t call my parents” ... 1. “My father was there” ... 1. “They didn’t call my parents but I told them” ... 1. “My mother didn’t talk to me in 3 months” ... 1. “I haven’t done this again” ... 1.

Substances consumption/ drug abuse.

General rates in the tables/ age differences in the texts below.

Table 19. On how many occasions have I had enough alcohol to get drunk?

I got drunk	In my lifetime	During the last 12 months	During the last 30 days
never	46.4	51.3	75.7
1 to 5 times	31.4	37.6	22.7
6 to 19 times	14	8.9	1.5
20 times or more	7.3	2.2	0.2

71.4% of 14 years old (or younger) respondents have never had alcohol, which means that 28.6% of them have already had it, and half of that group (15.1%) have had it 3 or more times -**1.9% say they got drunk 20 times or more.**

44.8% of 15 years old respondents have never had alcohol, which means that 55.2% of them have had it at least once, and 35.3% did it 3 or more times -**6% could be considered usual drinkers.**

30.4% of 16 years old respondents have never had alcohol, which means that 69.6% of them have had it at least once, and 46.6% did it 3 or more times -**9.9% could be considered usual drinkers.**

32.5% of respondents **over 16** years old (17 or more) say that they never had alcohol, which means that 68.5% of them have had it at least once, and 51% did it 3 or more times -**13.7% could be considered usual drinkers.**

Rural areas collect higher rates of alcoholic consumption (69.8% have had it) than urban areas (48.9%). Self-report rates of alcoholic consumption are very similar among **male** (51.9%) and **female** (55.4%) respondents.

Participants who were born in **Spain** present higher self-reported rates of alcoholic consumption (56.4% have got drunk) than students who were born abroad (42.7%).

Table 20. On how many occasions have I had cannabis?

I have had cannabis	In my lifetime	During the last 12 months	During the last 30 days
never	66.9	73.2	84.8
1 to 5 times	16.2	14.5	8.9
6 to 19 times	7.1	6.6	3.6
20 times or more	9.9	5.8	2.6

86.6% of 14 year old (or younger) respondents have never had cannabis, which means that 13.4% of them have already had it, and half of that group (6.3%) have had it 3 or more times **-1.8% say they had cannabis 20 times or more.**

68.5% of 15 year old respondents have never had cannabis, which means that 31.5% of them have had it at least once, and 21.8% did it 3 or more times **-9.7% could be considered usual consumers.**

53.8% of 16 year old respondents have never had cannabis, which means that 46.2% of them have had it at least once, and 32.7% did it 3 or more times **-15.5% could be considered usual consumers.**

51.4% of respondents **over 16** years old (17 or more) have never had cannabis, which means that 48.6% of them have had it at least once, and 34.1% did it 3 or more times **-15.5% could be considered usual consumers.**

Rural areas collect higher rates of cannabis consumption (51.2% have had it) than urban areas (27.9%).

Male respondents self-report higher rates of cannabis consumption (38.2% have had it) than female respondents (28.8%).

Participants who were born in **Spain** self-report higher rates of cannabis consumption (34.4% have had it) than students who were born abroad (25.7%).

On how many occasions have I had *other substances* in my lifetime?

List order: highest to lowest rates.

8.7% had medical pills with alcohol –151 people, 96 of them only once or two times.

3.3% had tranquilizer or sedatives –58 people, 36 of them only once or two times.

2.5% had magic mushrooms –43 people, 26 of them only once or two times.

1.9% had ecstasy or amphetamines –33 people, 15 of them only once or two times.

1.9% had heroin, cocaine or crack –33 people, 17 of them only once or two times.

1.7% had glue or something to sniff/ inhale –30 people, 16 of them only once or two times.

1.5% had LSD or other hallucinogens –26 people, 15 of them only once or two times.

0.8% of respondents have had anabolic steroids in their lifetime –14 people, 8 only once or two times.

Factors related to / explaining self-reported delinquency.

With the aim of helping the reader to have access to the information as easily as possible, those factors that could explain a concrete behaviour (rural-urban, male-female, age and national-foreigner) are already stressed in every chapter above.

Students' experiences.

Perceptions of attempts to prevent delinquent behaviour (focused on violence and substances).

We don't know the reason why some students participate and other don't. Maybe these activities are not compulsory activities. It seems that rural and foreign students get more information from the school than their urban and Spanish colleagues having other way of information.

Table 21. Amount of students having information on alcohol/drugs consumption

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
on alcohol and harmful substances in the last 12 months	78.2%			77.6%	81.7%	75.7%	86.9%		
in school by a teacher	52,8%			51.8%	57.6%	50.6%	59.3%		
in school by another person	43.6%	46.7%	40.8%	45.1%	35%	39.5%	55.8%		
by my parents	39.9%	38%	41.8%	41.5%	31%	42.2%	32.9%		
on the internet	18.5%	20.6%	16.5%	17.4%	24.5%	19.5%	15.4%		
in a youth centre	2.4%	3.4%	1.5%			2.8%	1.2%	<i>more if younger</i>	
by somebody else ⁶⁴	11.8%	10.3%	13.2%	12.2%	9.4%				

Table 22. Amount of students having information on violence

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
in any activity aimed at avoiding or reducing violence among young people	39.8%							49%	33%
training against bullying at school	74,7%	73%	76.3%					22.6%	28.6%
training on how to settle conflicts without violence	42,6%	44.4%	40.8%						

Did you participate in any other activity at school? (more if urban, local students and boys)

Namely (speeches are the most stressed activity).

Ethics and 'citizenship lessons': 9

Non-violence/ conflict resolution: 7

Drugs and alcohol: 4

Crime and juvenile justice: 4

Sexology: 2, Against sexist violence: 2, Speeches: 2, Films: 2

Did you participate in any other activity outside of school? (more if urban, local students and girls)

What? Namely:

Non-violence/ conflict resolution: 18 / Speeches and parallel activities in the classroom: 9

Sports: 3

Juvenile camps: 2, Medical/ social projects: 2, At home with parents: 1

By whom? Namely:

Youth center/ scout group/ church/ association: 9

Teachers: 8

Family: 6

Police: 4

Doctor/ psicologist/ hospital: 3, Friends: 3, Dance/ gym center/ sport teams: 3

Hooligan group: 1

⁶⁴ Friends/ schoolmates = 88

Speeches/ conferences = 15

Media (tv/ papers) = 12

Brothers/sisters/ cousins = 10

Uncle/ aunt/ grandparents = 8

Educators = 5, Sport coach = 5, Doctor/ psychologist = 5

Police = 2, Bartenders = 2

In relation with activities working well to prevent forbidden behaviours, a wide majority of respondents (over 80%) think that general prevention (a better education system, improving the possibilities of getting a job or having good emotion support) is the best way to keep them from doing forbidden things. Around 65% claim for better activities in leisure time, training on better behaviours, information on consequences and supporting their parents –they may look quite worried about their adolescent children. As a third remark, nearly half of the young people would support a more severe punishment. Age differences don't seem to be relevant at this point, but gender (male more than female), localisation (rural more than urban) and identity (local more than foreign) factors really affect. See information from Group Discussion 2.

Considered answers for the rank: “works very good + works”.

Table 23. Activities considered by students as working to prevent forbidden behaviours

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
giving them a good general education	85.6%								
improve their prospects to get a job	83.6%					84%	81.7%		
listening to their sorrows and problems	80.4%	76.1%	84.6%						
good opportunities for leisure time activities	64.7%					66.5%	58.7%		
giving information on possible consequences	64.4%								
providing training for better behaviour	63.8%					62.8%	67.4%		
providing counselling to their parents	62.1%								
punishing more severely when caught	48.5%	53.4%	43.8%	49.1% ⁶⁵	45.2%	47.3%	53%		

88.2% of participants think that something else would keep young people from doing forbidden things.

Namely:

Prison/ police/ control/ more severe laws and punishment...: 58

Medical treatment/ institutions/ therapy: 25

Less legal restrictions and less control (strictly named): 21

More and better social support/ solutions in the family: 14

Media/ campaigns: 9 (including 3 references to the tv reality show “Hermano mayor”).

Changes in the social environment/ peer groups: 8

Educative issues/ training/ school: 7

Some explicit answers like “hit them”, “kill them” or “torture them”: 5

Sport: 2

⁶⁵ Only item in which local students' rates are higher than foreign ones', which is emphasized in the “open question”

If we speak about important people to prevent youngster to do forbidden behaviours, as expected, adolescent peers (friends) are the most important reference –closely followed by parents. In a medium position we find the police, sport coaches and social workers –very curious because the majority of children don't have any contact with social workers. It's quite curious that teachers are given the last position in the tasks of preventing young people from doing forbidden things –although schools are the most active institutions in giving information about this behaviours. Teachers (remarked in the open question) is the only item in which foreign respondents' statements (as well as rural ones) are higher than local students' rates. Note specially higher female respondents' rates on social work and family. Higher male respondents believe on coach sport due to higher participation of male students in sport activities.

Table 24. People considered by students as important to prevent forbidden behaviours

		male	female	Spanish	foreign	urban	rural	14 or under	over 16
friends	92.7%	91.2%	94.1%	93.6%	87.2%	93.5%	89.7%		
parents	91.1%								
police	55.8%			56.1%	53.3%	55%	58.4%	63%	48%
sport coaches	52%	56.4%	47.6%			53.7%	45.9%		
social workers	48.1%	42.8%	53.2%	48.9%	43%	49%	45%		
teachers	41.6%			40.6%	47.3%				

Considered answers for the rank: “very important + important”.

83.8% think that others are important in keeping young people from doing forbidden things:

Family = 122 + Boyfriend/girlfriend = 26 + Social environment/ Friends = 16 (= 164)

Experienced people who'd been in the same trouble = 17 / Professionals/ experts = 15

Media/ famous people = 8

Politicians/ judges/ police = 6

“Myself” = 4

What works?

Table 25. Students' opinions on school influence on drugs consumption prevention

How much influence can school have on keeping students away from alcohol or drugs by participants' opinion		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no influence at all	306	17,3	17,6	17,6
	some influence	797	45,1	45,8	63,4
	medium influence	348	19,7	20,0	83,4
	strong influence	210	11,9	12,1	95,5
	very strong influence	79	4,5	4,5	100,0
	Total	1740	98,5	100,0	
Missing	System	26	1,5		
Total		1766	100,0		

At least 22% of the respondents didn't participate in such activities. Results differ if we calculate percentages on the total sample or just on the 78% (approx.) who participated in those activities.

Influence: taking into account the total sample, we can see that just 16.6% consider that the school has a *strong or very strong* influence in preventing students away from alcohol or drugs. 63.4% consider that the school has just some influence or not influence at all. 16.5% consider that the school has strong influence or very strong influence in preventing alcohol or drugs.

What are they **learning:** higher rates are shown by foreign, rural and female students. From a general perspective, 73.04% of the students who participate in those activities (56.9% sample) feel that they learned new facts about alcohol and drugs and 79.61% (62.1% sample) “learned new facts about health effects”. 58.5% (45.4%, 49.6% among the youngest ones) feels that they learned new facts about how to keep away from consumption and 57.27% (44.5%) learned about how to keep their friends away from it –worse when older. It looks like some of them improved their knowledge on consumption and its effects but not on keeping themselves safe from the risks.

Not learning: 20.4% (15.9% sample) say they didn't learn anything new and 44% (34.2% sample) answer to another question just saying that "it was nothing new to them". 24.68% (19.2% sample and 22.3% among the ones over 16) say that they feel more curious about some drugs now –this is one of the worries expressed by some professionals about programming activities related to drugs.

Table 26. Students' opinions on school influence on violence behaviour prevention

How much influence can school have on reducing student's violent behaviour by participants' opinion		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no influence at all	146	8,3	8,5	8,5
	some influence	496	28,1	28,9	37,4
	medium influence	580	32,8	33,8	71,1
	strong influence	378	21,4	22,0	93,1
	very strong influence	118	6,7	6,9	100,0
	Total	1718	97,3	100,0	
Missing	System	48	2,7		
Total		1766	100,0		

More than 60% of the respondents didn't participate in such activities –worse when older. Results differ if we calculate percentages on the total sample or just on the 39.5% (approx.) of participants. Nevertheless, this table shows how students consider that the school has a *strong or very strong* influence in preventing violent behaviour (28.1%). 37,4% consider that the school has just some influence or none at all.

What are they learning: only 53.4% (21.2% sample) of participants feel that the activities helped them to be better protected from violence, but 73.19% (29.2% sample) say they learned what to do when someone suffers an aggression. Activities seem to be considered by respondents as more important means to get better abilities and help a victim than to protect themselves from violence.

Only 50.25% (20% sample) of the activities' participants feel that the activities changed their way of thinking about violence, but 71.46% (28.3% sample), say they learned how to solve problems non-violently. In a similar trend, 66.83% (26.6% sample) learned how to face or deal with an aggression, and 79.24% (31.5% sample) received information on resources to turn to in case of being under threat.

Despite all these last results, just 50.75% (20.1% sample) consider that the activities made them feel more secure. In the other hand, 14.8% of participants (5.8% sample) feel more insecure after the activities. 84.9% (33.7% sample) feel more aware of how violence harms people, while 72.6% (27.8% sample) say that they are now more aware of possible punishments and other consequences.

It seems quite clear that most of schools are much implicated in fighting drugs and alcohol consumption, but not as much in activities to prevent violent behaviours among young people. In any of those cases, young, rural and foreign students state higher rates (both of participation and awareness) than older ones, although those best rates are mostly linked to dissemination/awareness-raising activities more than a practical dimension. Young students say they participate more at school activities and learn more than older ones about how to keep away from drugs and how to help their friends (49.6% 14 or under vs 39.4% over 16). Older students only show a higher rate on the "curiosity" these activities make them feel about substances.

Foreigners' rates on participation and activities' effects are the highest ones, which might make us take in account these resources as potentially useful tool –since the statements related on how to prevent young people from doing forbidden things, allusions to education, training, social support and work is mostly stressed by foreign students and punishment or severity is more frequently shown among local respondent's proposals.

Rural areas show higher school rates on participation, awareness-raising and effectiveness (both on substances and violence-related activities), while non-formal or extra-school activities are shown as much more widespread in urban areas.

The general description of activities at school is not good. Students evaluate their utility as low (only 24% among 14 or under and 18% over 16 say activities are helpful).

At a general level, we must note that foreign students are the collective that undoubtedly stresses a highest rate of participation (44.2% vs 39% of local respondents), influence and utility of these activities (either on substances or violence).

Factors related to / explaining students' different appraisals of preventive approaches.

With the aim of helping the reader to have access to the information as easily as possible, those factors that could explain a concrete behaviour (rural-urban, male-female, age and national-foreigner) are stressed in every chapter.

d) Discussion.

On self-reported delinquency:

-A first general difference: some offences are seen as normal (or normalized) and some others are clearly described as minority acts –. One of the most valuable issues arising from this part of the survey is how respondents perceive the severity of those facts, acts and attitudes. Undoubtedly, some of them mean, in the respondents' eyes, a not so serious problem. Female rates are under male data in all items, and rural rates are higher than urban data when referred to group fights, use of weapons, car theft, threat/discrimination, drug-selling, drug-consumption and vandalism (graffitti, etc) –urban rates are higher for shoplifting, robbery, bike stealing or breaking into buildings. Maybe we can stress a rural way of thinking the juvenile delinquency as having minor importance and a transitional behaviour related to the age.

-On sexist and violent values, main differences between ages are located in questions referring to sexist violence and other *hard-core* violent acts –respondents over 16 show the highest agreement rates in those items. Higher “sexism and violence” rates belong to older respondents, to boys far beyond girls, foreigners more than Spanish and rural areas over urban ones.

-The only items in which foreign rates are higher than local respondents' data are “group fights” and “use of weapons to hurt someone”.

-Attitudes. Short-term thinking is quite common and also rash behaviour. One third of respondents behave risky for fun. Less than a fifth don't mind how their acts affect other people, even if they are aware about these consequences –note that higher percentages are found among kids over 16 from rural areas and big age and sex gaps. Similar results have been stressed in Group Discussion 2.

-On victimization. First appreciation: although the general sense of victimization is low and rural areas show higher rates of self-reported violence in some items, higher rates of victimization are mainly located in urban areas. Most typical stressed problems are thefts or petty thefts. The use of technologies is growing as a mean to bother people –mainly girls under 16 from urban areas. The rest are very minority way of victimization.

On prevention activities:

-Respondents still consider than the best delinquency prevention is a primary intervention through school system, employment and care.

-In spite of that, the role of teachers in these preventive tasks is generally described by students as (surprisingly) irrelevant, as if they had not to be considered in the sphere of prevention⁶⁶. When asked about the most important areas and people around youngsters in order to prevent violent attitudes, friends and family are given the highest values --even if nearly half of them consider their friends opinion as irrelevant. Then police, sports coaches and social workers.

-Drug prevention is the most stressed activity –far beyond violence prevention, which shows a much lower rate of participation⁶⁷--, although the influence given by respondents to violence prevention activities is much higher.

⁶⁶ Probably under the influence of the signifiers “delinquency” and “violence”, which can turn some answers to the direct meanings of “control” and “response” as the survey shows that police is given a much more important role than education workers.

⁶⁷ 78% received info on drugs and 40% participated in activities focused on violence prevention, mostly at school –in both cases. Spanish-urban-female is the group that shows the highest rate of participation in those activities out of school. Although aggression, theft and violent attitudes in general are the most underlined problems in the group discussions, drug consumption (or addiction problems in general) is one of the most serious problems in the eyes of experts and professionals. More than 50% have got drunk and more than 30% have had cannabis.

- As shown by the redundant answers stated in proposals about “other”, there’s a low comprehension of these activities’ contents among many students.

-In the other hand, incidence of school in drug prevention seems to be considered by the students as a not too effective means –since acquired knowledge is meant to be more important than learned means of prevention. Violence prevention is given a better value in those terms.

-The stated incidence of contacts with the police –both quantitative (12% sample) and qualitatively, is low. More than 50% of the situations in which youngsters have had contacts with the police are directly linked to vandalism or legal/illegal drug consumption (after those, acts against property and aggressions/fighting), and the majority of them take place in public spaces.

-When asked about what should work, the most popular proposals among our respondents are: social resources, work opportunities, training/ information, aid and counselling to parents. More severe punishment or police activity is the last of stressed options –rural-Spanish-male is the profile that shows the highest rate supporting repressive management of violence and crime.