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The present study aims to analyze the relationships between community involvement, perception of family and school climate, and emotional and social problems in adolescents (satisfaction with life, non-conformist social reputation, and school violence). The sample was composed of 1884 (52% boys and 48% girls) adolescents aged from 11 to 17 years old ($M = 13.7, SD = 1.4$) from the Valencia Community and Andalusia. A structural equation model was calculated to analyze the data. The results indicated that adolescent community involvement was associated with positive perceptions of family and school climate, and school violence. Associations between the variables of the study included in the structural model were also analyzed as a function of gender. The relationship between school climate and social reputation was significant only for boys. Likewise, the association between community involvement and violent behavior was found to be significant only for boys. Finally, the results and their possible implications are discussed.
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With the present research, we intend to analyze the relationships between community involvement, perception of family and school climate, and variables related to the emotional problems (satisfaction with life) and social problems (non-conformist social reputation and school violence) of adolescents from a gender perspective. Many studies highlight the relevance of community, family and school in the psychosocial development of adolescents (Cava, Musitu, Buelga, & Murgui, 2010; Jessor, 1992, 1993). Likewise, there is an increasing interest on analyzing how these contexts influence psychosocial adjustment and, specifically, certain emotional and social problems in adolescence, like school violence (Berger, 2004). The nature of the relationships with parents and the quality of interactions with teachers and peers have been stated in previous studies to influence boys and girls differentially (Beamán, Wheldall, & Kemp, 2006; Carlo, Raffaelli, Laible, & Meyer, 1999; Estévez, Murgui, Musitu, & Moreno, 2008a; McDougall, Hymel, Vaillancourt, & Mercer, 2001; Mestre, Samper, & Frías, 2004).

With respect to the community environment, it is considered that community involvement, defined from the integration and participation of the adolescent in his/her community (getting involved in voluntary organizations and the social life of the neighborhood) is a key factor in his/her adjustment (Gottlieb, 1981; Jiménez, Musitu, Ramos, & Murgui, 2009), since these dimensions, together with the family and school dimensions, reduce the frequency of violent and criminal behaviors, and strengthen networks of support and friends (Hull, Kilbourne, Reece, & Husaini, 2008; Jiménez et al., 2009; Sun, Tripplett, & Gainey, 2004). We also highlighted the relevance of family involvement in the community, as for its positive effects in the psychosocial adjustment of children and in the family functioning, determining the climate experienced within the family unit (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). The family climate is an essential factor in the well-being and the adequate psychosocial development of the adolescent, who is under multiple changes and influences from different contexts. Specifically, the family climate refers to the psychosocial and institutional characteristics of the family and its environment (Guerra, 1993; Kemper, 2000), and it may be conceptualized as the environment perceived and interpreted by the family members. Furthermore, the family climate exerts significant influence on the behavior and the social, physical, affective and intellectual development of its members (Martínez, 1996; Schwarth & Pollishuke, 1995) and influences the configuration of the adolescent’s attitudes regarding social rules and behaviors, which are essential for participating in the life of the neighborhood consciously (Moreno, Estévez, Murgui, & Musitu, 2009a). Therefore, a positive family climate fosters cohesion, support, confidence and closeness among family members, favors open and empathic dynamics of family communication, and boosts the psychosocial resources of adolescents (Lila & Buelga, 2003; Musitu & García, 2004; van Aken, van Lieshout, Scholte, & Branje, 1999).

Likewise, the school climate, defined as the combination of subjective perceptions that teachers and students share about the characteristics of the school context and the classroom (Trickett, Leone, Fink, & Braaten, 1993), influence the behavior and integration of the students (Cook, Murphy, & Hunt, 2000; Cunningham, 2002). We can identify a positive school climate when students feel accepted and valued, they may express their feelings and opinions freely and they are involved in different activities within the school (Trianaes, 2000). This positive climate favors a good school, emotional and psychosocial adjustment of adolescent students, especially for those who have behavior problems at school (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997).

Considering previous studies we can think that there is a similarity in the results regarding the involvement of the adolescent in the community and the family and school climate. Following this assumption, a positive valuation of school and family environment is related to a greater willingness to follow the rules of collective and communitarian life (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Moreover, community involvement of adolescents is related to different rates of emotional adjustment, like satisfaction with life (Estévez, Murgui, Musitu, & Moreno, 2008b; Fariña, Arce, Novo, 2008; Huebner, 1991; Ying & Fang-Biao, 2005).

This last variable, satisfaction with life, has particular relevance in adolescence as it is an important predictor of adolescents adaptation to the different environments of growth (Seals & Young, 2003; Suldo, Riley, & Shaffer, 2006). Satisfaction with life is a cognitive component that is part of a wider construct called subjective well-being or life quality perceived (Suldo et al, 2006). Judgments on satisfaction are due to comparisons made by the individual between own life’s events and standard events he/she considers to be adequate. This last clarification is very important as it is not an externally imposed standard but a voluntarily assumed criterion (Atienza, Pons, Balaguer, & García-Merita, 2000). However, it is important to highlight that during adolescence the relationship with the group of peers acquires great relevance to the extent that it may greatly determine the ideal standard the adolescent wants to compare his/her satisfaction with. One of the fundamental characteristics of this ideal standard, which makes it a subjective grow model for the adolescent, is its social reputation, understood as a continuous perceptive-valuative process of the reference group on the individual, that determines the degree of integration or rejection and affects self-perception, self-evaluation and, also, regulates his/her behavior (Carroll, Houghton, Hattie, & Durkin, 1999; Moreno, Jesus, Murgui, & Martínez, 2012). The fact of reflecting an attractive and suggestive social image, impacts the feelings of belonging and social integration, which are closely related to satisfaction with life (Estévez, Herrero, Martínez, & Musitu, 2006; Gifford-Smith & Brownell, 2003; Moreno et al., 2009b).
In the specific case of violence, it was observed that adolescents achieve satisfaction and social recognition through non-conformist and law-breaking attitudes and behaviors. The association, made by some adolescents, between this attitudinal and behavioral pattern and its positive consequences, in terms of social reputation and satisfaction with life, may increase their risk for getting involved in violent behaviors (Emler & Reicher, 1995; Moreno et al., 2009b).

Previous theory review indicates the need for studying the involvement of the three contexts, family, school and community, in emotional and social problems of adolescents. We highlight the fact that there are very few studies that analyze these three environments jointly, especially those that consider community involvement (integration and participation in the community). Consequently, the first research question we ask ourselves is: to what extent are the community, family and school contexts related to the emotional and social problems of adolescents? The first goal of the current study is to analyze the relationships between the community, family and school contexts and satisfaction with life, non-conformist ideal reputation and violent school behavior.

Furthermore, following the logic of our work, we ask ourselves a second research question: do the variables previously mentioned differ by gender? Some studies indicate possible differences between boys and girls as for how they perceive the family, school and community climates, and their relationship with reputation and violent behavior (Estévez et al., 2008a; Rogoff, 1990). It is very probable that these differences have their origin in gender socialization, which takes place in specific activities, historically and culturally rooted, in which the main agents of socialization are involved (parents, teachers, peers, adults of the neighborhood, etc.). These activities are related to gender-typical behaviors, stereotypes and attitudes. Consequently, participation and learning from these, contributes to the development of different values, preferences, skills and expectations of boys and girls (Leaper & Friedman, 2007; Mestre, Samper, Frias, & Tur, 2009). Thereby, the second goal of this study is to analyze the relationships previously mentioned according to gender. This analysis is especially relevant as the studies related to emotional, school and social problems from a gender perspective, which consider, together, the perception of the adolescent about family, school and community are still incipient in the scientific literature.

Consequently, we state a theoretical model in which the initial hypotheses are the following: (1) community involvement will be directly and negatively related to violent behavior at school; (2) a high community involvement will be directly associated with a positive perception of family and school climate, and will be related, in turn, to low ideal reputation, high satisfaction with life and lower involvement of the adolescent in violent behaviors; (3) the relationships proposed in hypotheses 1 and 2 will be significantly different according to gender.
Method

Participants

A total of 1884 Spanish adolescents of both sexes participated in this study (52% males and 48% females) from 11 to 17 year-old ($M = 13.7$, $DT = 1.45$) from 9 Spanish schools (public and charter) that belong to the Valencia community and Andalusia, located in rural and urban environments, distributed in 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year of ESO (compulsory secondary education) and 1st and 2nd year of Baccalaureate. The sample represents the Spanish educational community, which has a population universe 2,446,715 students of ESO and Baccalaureate. A sample error of $\pm 2.5\%$, a confidence level of $95\%$ and a population variance of 0.5 were assumed. The sample size required was 1536 students. The selection of participants was performed through a stratified cluster sampling (Santos, Muñoz, Juez, & Cortiñas, 2003). The sampling units were the schools and highschools, public and charter, from rural and urban environments. The strata were established according to the variable course.

Procedure

First of all, the schools selected were sent a letter explaining the research project. Then, the schools managers were contacted by telephone and an interview was arranged, at which the project was explained in detail, and parents and students were given the informed consents together with a letter explaining the research project. After obtaining the corresponding permits, a briefing was held with the board of teachers of each school, at which the aims and scope of the investigation were explained.

The instruments were applied by a group of expert and trained researchers. The set of instruments was administered to the adolescents in their usual classrooms during a regular class period. The order of instrument administration was counterbalanced in every classroom and school. The bidirectional translation method was used for those instruments in the original English language. Students were informed at all times that participation in the investigation was voluntary and confidential. The study met the ethical values required in research with humans, respecting the fundamental principles included in the Declaration of Helsinki, in its updates, and in the current regulations (informed consent and right to information, protection of personal data and guarantee of confidentiality, no discrimination, no money involved and freedom to leave the study at any stage).

Instruments

Scale of Social Involvement in the Community (PCSQ, Herrero & Gracia, 2004). From this instrument, two subscales were selected: community integration (understood as the feeling of belonging and identification with the community or neighborhood; e.g., “I feel very happy in my neighborhood”) and community participation (degree to which the adolescent gets involved in social activities in his/her community; e.g., “I collaborate (alone, with my family, with friends...) in associations or activities carried out in my neighborhood”). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for these dimensions is .88 and .86, respectively.

Scale of Family Climate of Moos, Moos, and Trickett (1984). We used the subscale Relationships, which consisted of 30 binary items (true-false) that measure three dimensions: (1) Cohesion (degree of commitment and family support perceived by the children; e.g., “In my family, we really help and support each other”), (2) Expressivity (degree to which emotions are expressed within the family; e.g., “In my family, we comment our personal problems”), and (3) Conflict (degree to which anger and conflict are expressed between members of the family; e.g., “In my family, we criticize each other frequently”). The Cronbach’s alpha for these dimensions was .86, .73 and .85, respectively.

Scale of Social School Climate of Moos et al. (1984). This scale is composed of 30 items that report on the social climate and interpersonal relationships within the classroom, with true-false answer choices. The instrument measures three dimensions: involvement (e.g., “Students pay attention to what the teacher says”), teacher’s support (e.g., “The teacher shows interest in their students”) and friendship (e.g., “Many classmates become friends in this classroom”). Reliability of these subscales, according to Cronbach’s alpha, was .81, .82 and .78, respectively.

Scale of Non-conformist Ideal Social Reputation of Carroll et al. (1999). This instrument is composed of 7 items that assess the ideal reputation of the adolescent as an antisocial and non-conformist person with a scale of 4 answer choices from 1 -never- to 4 -always- (e.g., “I would like others to think I am a tough boy/girl”). The Cronbach’s alpha of this dimension was .78.

Scale of Satisfaction with Life of Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) (Spanish adaptation of Atienza et al., 2000). This scale provides a general rate of satisfaction with life, which is understood as a general construct of subjective well-being. The instrument consists of 5 items with an answer range of 1 -strongly disagree- to 4 -strongly agree- (e.g., “My life is, in most aspects, as I would like it to be”). The internal consistency measured through the Cronbach’s alpha was .81.

Scale of Violent Behavior of Little, Henrich, Jones, and Hawley (2003). This scale measures, with 24 items and an answering range that goes from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), behaviors that involve aggressions to others. The instrument measures six dimensions: pure shown violence (violent behaviors that involve physical or verbal violence without a stimulus that triggers the aggression; e.g., “I am a person who hits others”), reactive shown violence (physical or verbal violent behaviors as a response to the
Table 1
Pearson’s correlations and statistical significance. The coefficients obtained for boys are shown above and those for girls are shown below in italics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Climate/Cohesion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Climate/Expressivity</td>
<td>0.417**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Climate/No Conflict</td>
<td>0.522**</td>
<td>0.127**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate/Involvement</td>
<td>0.094**</td>
<td>0.067(*)</td>
<td>0.077(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate/Friendship</td>
<td>0.299**</td>
<td>0.160(**)</td>
<td>0.209(**)</td>
<td>0.401(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate/Teacher’s support</td>
<td>0.212**</td>
<td>0.131(**)</td>
<td>0.161(**)</td>
<td>0.349(**)</td>
<td>0.333(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement/Integration</td>
<td>0.228**</td>
<td>0.131(**)</td>
<td>0.189(**)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.115(**)</td>
<td>0.105(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement/Participation</td>
<td>0.117(**)</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.087(**)</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.084(*)</td>
<td>0.314(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td>0.268(**)</td>
<td>0.215(**)</td>
<td>0.206(**)</td>
<td>0.178(**)</td>
<td>0.209(**)</td>
<td>0.209(**)</td>
<td>22.4(**)</td>
<td>1.376**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Social Reputation</td>
<td>-0.182(**)</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.160(**)</td>
<td>-0.132(**)</td>
<td>-0.109(**)</td>
<td>-0.161(**)</td>
<td>-1.744(**)</td>
<td>-0.078(*)</td>
<td>-0.148(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Shown Violence</td>
<td>-0.228(**)</td>
<td>-0.073(*)</td>
<td>-0.127(**)</td>
<td>-0.135(**)</td>
<td>-0.183(**)</td>
<td>-0.183(**)</td>
<td>0.314(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Shown Violence</td>
<td>-0.200(**)</td>
<td>-0.080(*)</td>
<td>-0.199(**)</td>
<td>-0.159(**)</td>
<td>-0.203(**)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.006(*)</td>
<td>-0.006(*)</td>
<td>-0.253(**)</td>
<td>0.287(**)</td>
<td>0.555(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Shown Violence</td>
<td>-0.274(**)</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.267(**)</td>
<td>-0.115(**)</td>
<td>-0.105(**)</td>
<td>-0.173(**)</td>
<td>-0.203(**)</td>
<td>-0.209(**)</td>
<td>0.277(**)</td>
<td>0.689(**)</td>
<td>0.514(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Relational Violence</td>
<td>-0.199(**)</td>
<td>-0.087(*)</td>
<td>-0.175(**)</td>
<td>-0.136(**)</td>
<td>-0.076(*)</td>
<td>-0.127(**)</td>
<td>-0.202(**)</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.172(**)</td>
<td>0.169(**)</td>
<td>0.452(**)</td>
<td>0.261(**)</td>
<td>0.538(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Relational Violence</td>
<td>-0.177(**)</td>
<td>-0.084(*)</td>
<td>-0.076(*)</td>
<td>-0.127(**)</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.172(**)</td>
<td>0.169(**)</td>
<td>0.452(**)</td>
<td>0.261(**)</td>
<td>0.538(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Relational Violence</td>
<td>-0.200(**)</td>
<td>-0.073(*)</td>
<td>-0.109(**)</td>
<td>-0.159(**)</td>
<td>-0.203(**)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.006(*)</td>
<td>-0.006(*)</td>
<td>-0.253(**)</td>
<td>0.287(**)</td>
<td>0.555(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys mean</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls mean</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (1,1984)</td>
<td>0.01 n.s.</td>
<td>0.675**</td>
<td>0.01 n.s.</td>
<td>0.303**</td>
<td>0.39 n.s.</td>
<td>0.89 n.s.</td>
<td>1.22 n.s.</td>
<td>3.52**</td>
<td>0.01 n.s.</td>
<td>24.50***</td>
<td>40.88***</td>
<td>14.97***</td>
<td>48.04***</td>
<td>11.07***</td>
<td>17 n.s.</td>
<td>27.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys standard deviation</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls standard deviation</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perception of a previous aggression; e.g., “When someone makes me angry, I hit him/her”), instrumental shown violence (physical or verbal violent behaviors as a means to obtain something; e.g., “I threat others in order to get what I want”) pure relational violence (behaviors that involve social violence, like rejection or isolation from the group, or manipulation of others’ social relationships without a stimulus that triggers the aggression; e.g., “I am a person who treats others with indifference or stops talking to them”), reactive relational violence (behaviors that involve social violence, like rejection or isolation from the group, or manipulation of others’ social relationships as a response to the perception of a previous aggression; e.g., “When someone makes me angry, I gossip or tell rumors about that person”) and instrumental relational violence (behaviors that involve social violence, like rejection or isolation from a group, or manipulation of others’ relationships as a means to obtain something; e.g., “In order to get what I want, I do not let some people to become part of my group of friends”).

The Cronbach’s alpha for these six dimensions was .79, .82, .84, .62, .63 and .78, respectively.

Results

First of all, Pearson correlations between all the study variables were calculated, as a previous analysis of the relationships between the dimensions of the instruments selected and analysis of means differences by gender (MANOVA). These data are shown in Table 1 together with the mean values and standard deviations by gender. The results show significant correlations between all the variables in the expected direction, thereby they were included in the calculation of the structural equations model. With respect to the analyses of variance, boys obtained higher scores than girls in: involvement in the classroom (school climate), participation (community involvement), non-conformist ideal social reputation, pure, reactive and instrumental shown violence and pure and instrumental relational violence (violent behavior at school). Girls, compared to boys, reported higher scores in expressivity (family climate).

Next, a structural equations model was tested using the program EQS 6.0 (Bentler, 1995) in order to analyze the relationship between the variables. The model calculated consisted of the following latent factors: (1) community involvement, composed of two indicators or observable variables: community integration and community participation; (2) family climate, composed of three indicators or observable variables: cohesion, expressivity and conflict; (3) school climate, composed of three observable variables: involvement, teacher’s support and friendship; (4) satisfaction with life, composed of only one indicator; (5) non-conformist ideal reputation, composed of only one indicator; and (6) violent behavior, composed of six indicators: pure shown violence, reactive shown violence, instrumental shown violence, pure relational violence, reactive relational violence and instrumental relational violence. Table 2 presents the estimation of parameters, the standard error and the associated probability for each observable variable in its corresponding latent factor. Since the factors satisfaction with life and non-conformist ideal reputation were constructed from only one indicator, they present a factor loading of 1 and an error value of 0.

In order to determine the model’s goodness-of-fit and the statistical significance of the coefficients, robust estimators were used due to the normality deviation of the data (normalized Mardia’s coefficient: 52.45). The model calculated fitted the data well as indicated by the following rates: CFI = .96, IFI = .96, NNFI = .94 and RMSEA = .042 (.04, .05). Those values above .95 for rates CFI, IFI and NNFI, and values below 0.05 for the rate RMSEA are considered acceptable (Batista & Coenders, 2000). This model explains 15% of the final variable’s variance, violent behavior. Figure 2 shows the graphical representation of the final structural model with standardized coefficients and their associated probability.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration and Comm. Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.616*** (.123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressivity</td>
<td>.358*** (.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No conflict</td>
<td>.593*** (.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s support</td>
<td>1.023*** (.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>.963*** (.096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with life</td>
<td>1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conformist ideal reputation</td>
<td>1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure shown violence</td>
<td>1°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive shown violence</td>
<td>1.061*** (.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental shown violence</td>
<td>1.553*** (.086)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure relational violence</td>
<td>.790*** (.071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive relational violence</td>
<td>.969*** (.087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental relational violence</td>
<td>1.041*** (.071)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust statistics. Standard errors in brackets a Fixed in 1.00 during estimation

*** p < .001 (bilateral)
The results show different influence relationships between community involvement and adolescent’s violent behavior. In more detail, community involvement shows to be directly and negatively associated with violent behavior ($\beta = -0.09$, $p < .01$) and with non-conformist ideal reputation ($\beta = -0.08$, $p < .05$). Involvement is also linked directly and positively to adolescent’s satisfaction with life ($\beta = 0.24$, $p < .001$). Moreover, community involvement is indirectly associated with school violence. Thus, this variable shows a close relationship with family climate ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < .001$) and school climate ($\beta = 0.27$, $p < .001$). In turn, family climate is directly and negatively related to ideal reputation and violent behavior, and positively related to satisfaction with life ($\beta = -0.12$, $p < .001$, $\beta = -0.14$, $p < .001$ and $\beta = 0.17$, $p < .001$, respectively). School climate shows to be directly and positively related to adolescent’s satisfaction with life ($\beta = 0.20$, $p < .001$) and negatively related to violent behavior at school ($\beta = -0.10$, $p < .01$). Both the degree of satisfaction with life and ideal reputation are associated with participation in behaviors that involve violence ($\beta = -0.08$, $p < .01$ and $\beta = 0.22$, $p < .001$, respectively).

Finally, a multigroup analysis was carried out in order to check whether or not the relationships observed in the model differ according to gender. The restricted and non-restricted models of the multigroup analysis were statistically different for boys and girls ($D\chi^2 (15, N = 1657) = 48.84$, $p < .001$). The detailed analysis of the results showed that the relationship between the variable school climate and the variable ideal social reputation differed between the two genres, as this association was significant only for boys ($\beta = -0.17$, $p < .001$) and not for girls ($\beta = 0.10$, $p > .05$). Despite removing this restriction, the restricted and non-restricted models were statistically different ($D\chi^2 (14, N = 1657) = 29.74$, $p < .01$). The relationship between the factor community participation and the factor school violence was significant only for boys ($\beta = -0.17$, $p < .001$) and not for girls ($\beta = 0.01$, $p > .05$). Once both restrictions were removed, the models were statistically equivalent ($D\chi^2 (13, N = 1657) = 19.19$, $p > .05$).

Discussion

In this study, we analyzed the relationships between community involvement, perception of the main climates (family and school), and the variables related to emotional
and social problems (satisfaction with life, non-conformist ideal reputation and violent behavior at school) in adolescents. The results obtained show a direct and negative relationship between community involvement and adolescent’s violent behavior at school, as it was proposed in our first hypothesis. Adolescents involved in the community participate in fewer violent behaviors at school, which suggests a protective effect of community involvement against school violence. This possible effect may be attributed, mostly, to the fact that the involvement of other significant adults of the community in the socialization of the adolescent is greater in cohesive communities than in non-cohesive communities (Buelga, Musitu, Vera, Ávila, & Arango, 2009). The parents and adults of the community act as social models and play the role of supervising and guiding the behavior of the younger (Sampson et al., 1997). As a consequence, adolescents express fewer violent behaviors and show better emotional and social adjustment. We consider that this aspect should be explored in greater depth, assessing the degree of cohesion and integration of communities thoroughly.

With respect to the second hypothesis, an indirect and negative relationship is observed between community involvement and violent behavior. This process may be attributed to the social involvement of the adolescent in the daily life of the neighborhood and, also, to the involvement of his/her family, which seems to have a repercussion on family life that, in this study, was evaluated from family climate (Martínez, 2007). Likewise, community involvement seems to decrease the risk of being victimized, which leads to a more positive school climate, greater satisfaction and better psychosocial adjustment of the student (Jiménez et al., 2009), considering that school integration and adjustment are, in turn, related to positive family climates. Therefore, we found two forces that converge in one direction.

We believe it is interesting to highlight that the relationship between school climate and ideal reputation postulated in the theoretical model has not been confirmed in the final structural model calculated for both sexes. This result becomes more important after observing the multigroup analysis according to gender. In this sense, we think it is appropriate to make a digression in order to explain this discovery and introduce and develop some interpretations suggested by the analysis of the third hypothesis, which proposes possible differences according to gender. The data obtained show that the relationship between school climate and ideal reputation is significant in males but not in females. Thus, the boys are more likely to desire a reputation based on leadership, power within the group of peers and non-conformism, as a response to their discomfort within the classroom, and they might use violence in order to achieve it.

It is possible that the role of girls within the classroom, who do not consider the influence of school climate on the development of their reputation to be so important as boys do, may have a damping effect that limits the search for this type of non-conformist reputation and it also seems to inhibit violent behavior in boys. However, we consider this result, unexpected in our hypothetical model, to indicate the need for including gender in the analysis of school violence; thereby we believe it would be interesting to deal this issue in greater depth in further research.

Also, this unexpected result could be enriched from the differences in the styles of socialization at (Musitu & García, 2004; Tur, Mestre, & Barrio, 2004). Our results support those obtained by Estévez et al., (2008a) regarding the relevance of family and school climates according to gender. According to the data of our investigation, boys are more likely to give greater relevance to school climate than girls, as a perceptive space in which they develop and maintain their social reputation. In this sense, negative interactions with classmates and teachers ease the development of rebellious reputation and rejection attitudes toward the school context, especially in boys, which may favor the adolescent’s involvement in violent acts. The influence of school and family climates differ in boys and girls, so the relationships between community, family and school may have a different weight or play a different role in the psychosocial adjustment of the adolescent.

Another aspect we consider to be very important in the current study is the one related to community involvement and school violence according to gender. It was observed that integration and participation in the community is related to fewer violent behaviors at school, but only for boys. This result is consistent with those obtained by South (2001) in the sense that boys are more involved in their communities and neighborhoods than girls and this, in turn, is related to their adjustment. The author argues that boys are more involved in the community than girls due to differences of gender in the process of socialization. Males usually have a less close and continued paternal supervision than females and, thus, they can spend more time in community activities. Besides, according to South (2001), if parents supervise their daughters more strictly than their sons, girls could be less exposed to the negative influences of the neighborhood, but they would also avoid the positive influences of the involvement of female adolescents in the community.

We believe it is interesting to highlight that adolescents involved in the community express greater feelings of satisfaction with life. We consider that this potential effect in the subjective well-being may be consolidated in friendly relationships with other peers and adults of the neighborhood, which help expanding and strengthening the adolescent’s social support network (Arias & Barrón, 2008; Sun et al., 2004). It is well known that the relationships established within the community favor the adolescent’s adjustment, as they positively influence self-concept, feelings or worth and personal control, and conformity with social rules (Cohen, Gottlieb, & Underwood, 2000; Jiménez et al., 2009; Martínez, Amador, Moreno, & Musitu, 2011). Volunteer
activities in the neighborhood, for example, stand out from among the activities that foster community involvement, social relationships and satisfaction with life (Dávila & Chacón, 2004; Vecina, Chacón, & Sueiro, 2009). This type of activities that favor community involvement may also transmit a type of reputation, based on friendship, public spirit, solidarity and cooperation within the neighborhood that, usually, is suggestive and, moreover, valued by both adults and other peers.

It could be thought that when adolescents perceived themselves to be integrated and active within their community they feel that family and school environments work adequately, which, in turn, impacts their satisfaction and social reputation. It is very probable that this could have an effect on the decrease of hostile behaviors within the classroom and in emotional and social aspects. On the contrary, those adolescents that do not get involved and do not feel to be part of the community might experience poor satisfaction with life. Thus, some of them may attempt to base their social reputation on non-conformity and the transgression of rules. These dimensions seem to be the ones that lie in the involvement of adolescents in violent and disruptive behaviors, whose aim is, in many cases, to show a false image and arrogance in order to feel important, loved and valued within a group of peers, characterized by a poor psychosocial adjustment (Moreno et al., 2009b).

Furthermore, our results suggest that community involvement is related to the perception of family and school climates, thus contributing to the adequate emotional and social development of the adolescent. In this sense, we highlight the study performed by Pedersen et al., 2005), whose results are in line with those obtained in our model, and it indicates that the involvement of adolescents in multiple contexts (family, school and community) is associated with more adaptive psychosocial results than those adolescents who are little involved or get involved in just one of environments mentioned.

Finally, it is important to state that the results presented in this study must be interpreted with caution due to the transversal nature of the study, therefore we cannot establish causal relationships between the variables. However, the model presented suggests the need for considering the importance of the perception of the most relevant contexts in the development of the adolescent. We highlight the need, due to the shortage and the importance of the community context, for performing new studies that contribute to the analysis of how community involvement may affect the configuration of gender differences in those aspects related to the emotional, school and social dimensions of adolescent boys and girls.

Moreover, it is important to remark, from the results obtained, the need for including the community work in socio-educational programs, especially the dimensions of integration and community participation, together with family and school. We think that the community environment, together with gender differences, must be integrated in the structure of those socio-educational programs aimed to help adolescents with social and emotional problems. This dimension, frequently ignored in socio-educational programs of help, has been stated in this study and in other studies that include the community dimension which have already been mentioned in the current investigation, that it is closely related to school and family; this is why we highlight the importance of these three contexts in prevention and intervention programs with adolescent students.
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