**AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
95TH ANNUAL CONVENTION
AUGUST 12-16, 2000
WASHINGTON , D. C.**

"Protest and Violence in Greek Schools, with Special Reference to Upper Secondary Schools"

(For Collective Behavior Session)

(Working Paper: Not for Quotation without permission of the author)

Nicholas P. Petropoulos**, Antonia Papastylianou,
Panos Katerelos & Kostas Harisis

**Pedagogic Institute
Athens, Greece**

**Pedagogic Institute, Messogeion 396, Agia Paraskevi
15341; Telephone: 00301-6016-376; Fax: 00301-6012-
199; E-mail: nppsoc@pi-schools.gr**

PROTEST AND VIOLENCE IN GREEK SCHOOLS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO UPPER SECONDARY SCHOOLS[1]

During the last   10 years, several studies mainly in Western Democracies (Bullock et al, 1996; Gold, 1996; Stromquist & Vigil, 1996; NCES, 1997; Shen, 1997; Haynes and Chalker, 1999) suggest that there has been an increase of collective and individual forms of violence in schools. Moreover, there are indications that there may have been a qualitative change in the form of an increase of mass victimization forms of violence in Schools. Cases of mass victimization, student bullying and vandalism have been noted both in the United States and in European countries (Olweus, 1995), although the US has comparatively higher rates of school violence (Haynes & Chalker, 1999). In Greece, although the above forms of violence have not yet attained disturbing proportions , they are becoming more and more evident. School occupations, as a form of collective protest are often   accompanied by violence (in the form of vandalism, property destruction, and graffiti) the precipitators of which could be either among the students themselves or non-student elements.

The consequences of these various forms of violence are both human and material (Goldstein, 1996, pp. 8-15; Furlong et al, 1995). First and among the human consequences, we must include the immediate threats to one's physical existence (death and injuries of students, teachers and other school personnel). Second and in the same   category of effects, we must also include the psychological traumas on the above individuals, which may be long-term and impact all aspects of an individual's life.   Third, violence and threats of violence also have an impact upon the educational process and the operation of schools which in turn impacts on both the victims (e.g. the non-attendance by the threatened or victimized persons) and on the victimizers (e.g. expulsion, dropouts, marginalization, criminalization) which may impact on the educational and occupational mobility of both the victims and the victimizers. Finally, violence - and specifically vandalism and destruction   of property - has direct and indirect economic costs (indirect in the sense of its impact upon human capital as defined above and also in terms of investments for security measures) and direct in terms of property restoration following destruction.

To minimize the various consequences and costs of school violence, governments have given top priority in their national agendas to control and prevent it .   And this is not only in terms of increased budgetary allocations for control and intervention programs, but also in terms of subsidizing social studies to investigate the "causes" of school violence in order to follow up with more effective intervention and prevention programs.

Social scientists have had recourse to several theoretical models in trying to understand the causes of school violence, including biological-ethological theory, orthodox psychoanalysis, frustration-aggression theory and social learning theory. More recently (See Goldstein, 1996) to these have been added the "enjoyment, aesthetic and equity-control theories. Generally, these perspectives, except perhaps for the social learning and the equity control theories, are principally psychological theories, and do not taken into account the larger community and societal aspects (the sociological perspective). Actually, most research, depending upon the division of labor among social scientists, follows a disciplinary approach, and holds the factors of the other disciplines constant (**ceteris paribus**) . In the final analysis, the various studies complement one other, complete the etiological puzzle of school violence, suggesting that all factors, others more and others less, may play a role in the production of school violence.

Some studies (Bijttebier and Vertommen, 1998; Dykeman et al, 1996; Lowenstein, 1986; Mynard & Joseph, 1997) give priority to the **psychological** antecedents of school violence - focusing on the nature and structure of the personality of the perpetrators and their victims- and include such variables as self-esteem,   locus of control, coping strategies, ability to express aggression etc. Although the outcomes are not uniform, these psychological studies could be very instructive in regard to the social skills which may be necessary to instill in young people in the short-run but also suggest new ways of socialization in order to prevent in the long run the development of such personalities with all the attendant implications for school violence.

Other studies (Banks, Eric Digest, 1999; Christensen & Clark, 1996; Kanakis, 1996; Krauss et al., 1996; Tygart, 1993 and 1988) have studied the impact of "demographic" characteristics such as **age and sex**   or **race and class** as factors or correlates of school violence. With regard to age and sex, most of the studies suggest higher incidence of vandalism (e.g. defacing property, littering, school violence, etc.) among the males, and more recourse to symbolic forms of violence with increasing age. Of course, these factors are not strictly demographic. They are interwoven - in the context of specific cultures - with differential socialization (social learning) practices and developmental processes.

With regard to **race and class** - concepts with are also interwoven with concepts of minority deprivation, discrimination and social exclusion and which may also refer to the racial and class composition of the school as well as to the racial and class (socioeconomic) identification of both the perpetrators and the victims- the evidence (Ellis et al, 1993; Kimweli and Anderman, Eric Digest, 1999 ; NCES, 1997; Price & Everett, 1997) has not been uniform. Some studies (NCES, 1997; Price and Everret, 1997) Tygart, 1988) have observed positive associations between race and or/social status, while others (e.g. Kimweli & Anderman, 1999; Banks, Eric Digest 1999; Ellis et al., 1993) have not noted any associations with social and minority status. These conflicting findings suggest perhaps limitations of the classical frustration-aggression theories and the need to take into consideration theories and concepts of relative deprivation.

Some studies have also considered the impact of the **family structures and processes** on school violence. Family pathology - disorganization and divorce - is theoretically and often empirically a significant antecedent of school violence (Workman & Beer, 1992). Some writers (Morrison et al, 1998) point to the displacement of family functions and the eclipse of the parents' traditional caretaker role as a significant cause of school violence. Some of the social analysts go as far as to attribute the family breakdown and its impact upon violence on the women's empowerment and liberation movement. In any case, while they may be a correlation between family disorganization and school violence, there have also been studies which have not demonstrated this connection , suggesting that we should also look at the family processes (e.g. forms of parental discipline, use of violence by and between parents etc.) (Stromquist & Vigil, 1996).

Other studies have also assessed the impact on school violence of **school structures and processes**, including such factors as school size, student-teacher ratio. These factors, no doubt relate to the intervening factors of mass schools, bureaucracy, impersonalization, and alienation (the idea that the school is a factory and students are just numbers). Again, their impact on school violence has not been uniform, with some studies (Hellman & Beaton, 1986; Stromquist & Vigil, 1996) noting a direct relationship with violence while other studies (Banks, Eric Digest 1999; Pablant & Baxter, 1996) reporting no relationship. Possibly, one may have to assess the nature of the interaction, and the nature of compensatory mechanisms (e.g. social services, individualized teaching, etc.) that may exist in large schools and may counteract expressions of school violence

School climate - which is an important component of school structure and process - has to do with the structure of social and power relations among the administrators, teachers, students and other school personnel. Generally, studies (Baker, 1998; Walker, Eric Digest 1999; Weishew & Peng, 1993) have shown that a good school climate has been found to be associated with less school violence, although the findings are not always uniform (Moore, 1998), nor is it always clear if the operational definition of school climate is consistent across studies.

Aside from the above structural aspects of schools, social scientists (Baker 1998; Kalogridi, 1995; Rapti, 1995; Vooidaskis, 1997; Warner et al, 1999) have also assessed the impact of **school processes**. First, a curriculum, a pedagogy and a student evaluation system which are not adjusted to the ability levels and the cultural values/orientations of the student population could create problems and frustrations and could culminate in school protest, aggression and violence. For example, formative and qualitative evaluation systems may be more appropriate for students from disadvantaged backgrounds than summative and quantitative forms of assessment. In addition, the student evaluation systems can operate through the labeling process with its known outcomes and may also affect the academic progress and vocational opportunity routes of the students.

Some researchers have also investigated the impact of **school discipline policies** on school violence. A fair and equal treatment of students tends to reduce school violence (Stromquist & Vigil, 1996). An important and widespread type of disciplinary system (enforced widely within the U.S.) which may be firm but not necessarily fair and which has been assessed is "zero tolerance."   Some studies (Burke & Herbert, 1996) report positive outcomes for this type of discipline, while others (Morrison & D'Incau, 1997; NCER, 1997; Skiba et al., 1999) show higher rates of violence, especially school vandalism, in schools which had adopted ZT policies and question its effectiveness (e.g. one of these studies suggests that only a minority of students should have been suspended). Aside from the need to consider methodological issues (e.g. which came first, ZT or vandalism?) there is also a need to consider the modeling impact of schools, as well as the contribution of schools to the more permanent marginalization of youth, especially of those who do not deserve it (e.g. expulsion leading to social exclusion and to delinquency etc.).   Perhaps there is also a need to view the fairness of discipline in conjunction with the firmness. The severity of discipline in an authoritarian context may have the opposite impact, especially in subcultures seeking to challenge authority systems.

With regard to school processes, other social scientists (Tygart , 1991; Vidali, 1995) have shown that participation in **extracurricular activities and /or political mobilization by the students** tends to reduce school violence. At first hand, this sounds logical, in view of the fact that such participation can constitute an important tension-reduction alternative.   More important, however, participation in such activities may signify some form of student empowerment and may also improve the social skills of students with respect to problem-solving and conflict resolution.   Nonetheless, it is important to unravel the causal process (could it be that selection factors were operating?), perhaps with the use of experimental or causal(path analysis) of the participation and violence statistics.

Going beyond the internal school structures and processes, some social scientists (Baker, 1998; Goldstein, 1996, pp. 282-889 and Ley & Cybriwsky, 1996) adopted research models reminiscent of the classical Chicago School and suggest that we pay more attention to the **semantics of ecology** In this connection, social scientists have observed (Furlong et al, 1997; Pablant & Baxter, 1996) that schools which are located in low-activity, low habitation, economically depressed and drug-and-crime ridden areas are more prone to school violence.   In addition, schools characterized by poor upkeep of the school grounds and which are located in areas where the surrounding buildings allow for low vigilance are also more prone to school violence(Ley & Cybriwsky 1996).[2]   Moreover, an urban context has been shown (N.C.E.S., 1997, Price & Everret, 1997) to be associated with school violence, although the evidence (Banks, Eric Digest 1999) is not always uniform. Moreover, it is expected that the increasing importance of the "global village,"

---

[2] The increased incidence of forest fires (due to arson) , in Greece, has oftentimes been attributed to the increased urbanization and the abandoning of the countryside by Greek farmers.

the "mass culture", and "education from a distance"   will make the urban-rural differential in school violence less and less decisive.

The student as person and the school as an organization function not only within an micro-sociological ecological setting as described above, they also constitute units within the larger society.   Thus, it is only logical that some social scientists (Gold et al, 1996; Shaw & Cameron, 1999; Vidali, 1995; Yohji, 1996) should also look at the contribution of the societal and cultural historical context to school violence.   It is a macrosociological analysis of school violence which is needed if we must look at comparative differences in the prevalence and incidence of school violence.   For example one should look at the legal structure of countries regarding gun possession.   In this connection, the U.S. leads the world since it views gun possession as a constitutional right of its citizens and a large percentage(42%) of its population owns hand guns (Stromquist and Vigil, 1996, p. 171).

In addition, societies may vary in the value constellations, e.g. importance of family relative to the individual which affect the prevalence and incidence of school violence.   In comparison with USA and other European countries, Greeks maintain closer extended family relations and espouse more collective values (Georgas, 1999; Papademou, 1999)—values which do not show much differentiation between the rural and urban regions.

Also, some societies may be at different stages of social and economic development, e.g. transition to new economic, political and social systems, urbanization or social revolution (e.g. women's empowerment movement, the increasing "privatization" of Japanese society) - which may temporarily lead to anomia processes in a Durkheimian sense and may precipitate various forms of violence, societal or school - until the new institutions reach a new level of stability, legitimation and institutionalization.

The actual rates of violence in a society, whether "criminal" or "non-criminal" (e.g. attacks on other nation states), the violation of laws by persons holding key posts in society, which are broadcast on a global scale and subject to differential interpretations, may also facilitate violence on a local, school and personal level following the recourse to the mechanisms of crime neutralization (See Sykes and Matza, 1957).[3]

Finally, the level of violence, of whatever kind , that is portrayed on the popular culture media (TV, movies etc.) and the daily exposure of children to

---

[3] The Greek people viewed President Clinton's declarations and exhortations, following the mass killing of students in Denver, Colorado, as hypocritical in view of his bombardment of Yugoslavia and the "collateral damages" on the human populations.   The bombardment of Yugoslavia was viewed as an   international crime since it violated NATO's charter (Yugoslavia had not attacked another nation),   the UN Charter as it did not have the endorsement of the UN Security Council and also the US Constitution since there was no declaration of war against Yugoslavia by Congress. Except for some minor differentiations regarding the direct participation in the bombing, all the NATO leaders endorsed with their signature the bombardment of Yugoslavia.   No doubt, such international violations can provide negative social models as well as crucial alibi (read techniques of neutralization) for local, school and personal acts of violence.

it may under some conditions also affect school violence. Margaret McClean (1996), referring to the impact of the entertainment industry from the production of such movies as the "Blackboard Jungle (1955) and "Lean on Me" (1988), said that "Perhaps the greatest damage done by this negative focus is to cause people to see schools as places that are the source of violence rather than as places that reflect the violence of society as a whole.

It is a truism that the general societal, cultural and historical processes which may act to exacerbate violence are more evident in some societies than in others. In conjunction with community, ecological, school and personal factors they could increase or decrease the incidents of violence and protest in specific situations.

The purpose of the present research and analysis was to assess the relationship between the various social, ecological and psychological factors to forms of violence and protest in the Greek school system and student population, with special emphasis on collective forms of protest and violence such as occupations of school buildings, destruction of property (vandalism) and graffiti behavior. A second task was to assess the possible inter-correlation between the various forms of collective protest and forms of school violence.

Occupations of school buildings by students as a form of collective protest by students are very popular among Greek youth , on both the university and the upper secondary levels.[4] They have attained "legitimacy" as a form of collective protest since the occupation of the Polytechnic University in 1973 (See Gotovos, 1996; Vitsilaki-Soroniati, 1993) which is said to have played a crucial role in the fall of the dictatorship. Second, because there is a conception of students as future workers, with the same rights as the workers and with school occupation as a surrogate right to strikes. Thirdly, because occupations usually take place following "democratic" procedures, i.e. after a majority vote by the student governments which were institutionalized perhaps as a reward for the role of students in overthrowing the dictatorship but also as means for the political socialization of youth. These conditions have provided a "structural conduciveness" for school occupations.

On the university level, the occupation of schools is also protected by the rights of asylum, preventing intervention by the police. Several times in the past, especially on the anniversary of the Polytechnic University Protest against the dictatorship (November 17), the University was occupied by non-

---

[4] Few systematic empirical sociological studies have been done on the phenomenon of school occupations. The most comprehensive of these on a student level is a regional study done by Gotovos (1996) which interviewed about 4.000 secondary school (lower and upper secondary) students with regard to their participation, their perceptions and attitudes. The study observed that about 49% of the students had taken part in at least one school occupation. Another more recent study was a national survey of 1600 young people between 15 and 29 years of age which was commissioned by General Secretariat for Youth (1999) and also included questions on attitudes regarding forms of collective protest. The survey observed that 31% of the sample approved of school occupations, the percentage approving being higher for the student than the non-student sub-sample .

student elements wearing masks (the "known unknowns" as the Greek press calls them) ho had caused much property destruction (laboratory equipment, cultural artifacts etc.). On the upper secondary levels, the right of asylum does not hold. Until recently, the attorney general and police intervention were possible only after authorization by the school Principal.

During the school year 1998-99, a wave of school occupations on the secondary level (especially the upper Lyceum levels) took place to protest the government's new educational reforms which established comprehensive schools, increased the number of subjects examined for entrance to higher education, abolished the queue line in the hiring of teachers and legislated into existence the evaluation of the educational system and personnel (including the teachers). The reforms generated "structural strain" on all the levels of the school community. Almost 90% of the Lycea (about 1000) were occupied. The occupation lasted from 1 to 60 days, with the average occupation lasting 17 days. During the school occupations there were also vandalism and graffiti behaviors in some of the occupied schools.

Toward the end of the occupations the students set up road blocks and occupied street intersections. The occupations brought various forms of confrontation, between parents and students, between the parents on opposing sides, and between the students and drivers at the traffic intersections. In some cases, --especially in the cases where there was property destruction - the school Principals called the Attorney General and requested police intervention. To make up for lost class time and to cover the curriculum, the government was forced to extend the school year and also make cuts in text materials for final examinations.

During the current school-year (1999-2000) when there was a threat of repetition of school occupations, the government passed a Ministerial Council Act (which has the validity of law) in order to make school occupations illegal and to enable the Attorney General to intervene without permission of the school Principal. In a way, the Ministerial Act removed one of the factors which were "structurally conducive" to occupations. Although there were reactions especially on the part of the minority and left political parties, the Ministerial Act and the threat of non-extension of the school year in the event of occupations (tantamount to loss of the school year), seemed to have worked in preventing an escalation of school occupations—something which no doubt pleased the government on the eve of elections.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Sampling. To evaluate the working hypotheses of the study, the researchers used a two-stage stratified, random sampling of four categories of schools: the six-year elementary schools (ages 6 -12), the gymnasia or lower secondary schools (ages 12-15), the Lycea or upper secondary schools (ages 15-18) and the technical vocational, upper secondary schools (years 15-18) . Taking into account the variance of school violence among school

levels (more common on the higher levels), the research team purposely undersampled the schools on the lower levels and oversampled those on the higher levels in order to allow for a more systematic evaluation of the working hypotheses.

During the second stage of sampling , the selected schools were distributed proportionately within the 54 geographical units (prefectures) on the basis of level of urbanization (urban, semi-urban and rural). The final samples of usable schools consisted of 65 elementary schools, 153 gymnasia, 144 general lycea and 64 technical-vocational schools. The analysis on the levels of schools will focus primarily on the 208 upper secondary schools (general and technical vocational schools).

Following the selection of schools, samples of students were selected from general education classes and systematically from the teachers' catalogues as follows: five students from the final grade (6th) of the elementary schools, five from the final grade of the gymnasium (3rd), and 15 students (five from each of the three classes) from the Lycea-the upper secondary schools.[5] The final usable samples of students were as follows: 309 from the elementary school level, 767 from the lower secondary gymnasium level, 1378 from the general upper secondary Lycea and 472 from the upper secondary technical schools.   The analysis on the student level will focus primarily on the combined sample of 1850 upper secondary school students.

B. Data collection. To collect the data on both the school and the student levels, the research team constructed two types of questionnaires, one for the Principals (school level) and one for the students (student level). On the school level,   two separate questionnaires were constructed, one for the elementary schools and another one for the Principals of the lower and upper secondary schools. On the student level, three separate questionnaires were constructed, one for each academic level.

The questionnaires on the *school level* contained questions on   (1) the characteristics of the school Principal (e.g. demographic, educational background, types of training, years of service, etc.), (2)   the school infrastructure (e.g. school size, students per class, square meters of school yard per student, presence and use by students of library facilities, etc.)   (3) ethnic-religious composition of schools (e.g. number of return migrant children in school, number of foreign migrant children etc.) (4) the presence of various services for students (e.g. remedial classes, language classes etc.) (5) the organization of extracurricular activities in school (e.g. environmental programs, discussions on health and drugs, contests and art exhibits, student council activities and effectiveness etc.)   (6) school climate (e.g. scale[6],

---

[5] The research team had initially planned to use three students from each of the three Lyceum classes but used five instead during the interview in order to secure the anonymity of the students. In the final analysis, two students from each class of the Lyceum schools were randomly eliminated.

[6] The study used an adapted version of the school climate scale developed by Kavouri & Ellis (1996). The scale was subjected to a factor analysis (principal component analysis, varimax, with Kaiser Normalization) , separate for the different levels of school. The factors for the Lyceum were: "Sociability", "Respect among Teachers", "Work Load," "Respect of Teachers

nature of relations among students, teachers, parents, community, local government and school administration) and (7) the dependent variables (e.g. violence, vandalism, graffiti and occupation of schools by students).

More specifically, and with regard to the operation of the dependent variable relating to incidents of violence in schools, the Principals were asked to check on a five-point scale (never-very frequent) the frequency of occurrence of (1) beatings between students which ended in wounds (2) fights with students from other schools (3) destruction of school furniture, walls and toilets (4) destruction of organs, maps, books and other forms of school infrastructure (5) theft of organs, books and electrical appliances (6) thefts among the students themselves (7) writing of slogans and derogatory phrases with spray and paints on the walls and (8) other.

An item inter-correlation analysis (not shown) revealed that the above 8 items were all positively inter-correlated, and 18 of the 21 were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. For the present report, items 1 and 2 were combined to form the index of "violence against persons; " items 3, 4 and 5 were combined to form an index of "violence against school property" ("vandalism"). Items 6 and 7 were used separately and independently as indicators of "theft " and "graffiti" behavior among the students.

The school Principal's questionnaire also contained a question on occupation of schools, during the school years 1991/92 to 1998/99. The Principals were asked to check if occupation of their school by students took place during the pre-designated school years and if so, to record the duration of the occupation in days. Although school occupations are critical collective behavior events which are usually remembered, the research team decided to use the occupations during the last school-year (1998/99) since there is a frequent turnover of Principals and the data of former years may not be as reliable and because these occupations constituted mass reactions to the government's educational reforms.

The upper secondary school questionnaire on the **student level** contained questions on demographic characteristics (e.g. age, sex etc.); the student's academic status (e.g. grade); his family background (e.g. education of parents); the connectedness of the extended family; participation in common family activities; substance use by parents and siblings; the student's perception of just treatment by significant others in the family, the school and in daily life; student's perception of family concern; the experience of various types of victimization (e.g. physical violence, sexual, verbal, prejudice, theft) by teachers, fellow students, members of the family and relatives, known and unknown persons; the commission of various types of deviant and violent acts by the students (see below for the operation of the dependent variable); the student's perception of the fairness of discipline by the parents and the teachers; the use of leisure time by students; participation in student government and extracurricular activities; the student's average grades; the number of absences; vocational orientation; the use of substances by the

by the Principal" and "Review of the Teachers by the Principal." The variance explained was 58%.

students themselves; knowledge about health issues; the arrest record of the students; total family income; the importance of religion to the students; and two scales, one measuring self-esteem (Battle, 1981) and the other coping orientations(Bezevekis, nd).[7]

With regard to the measurement of the dependent variable (forms of violence) on the student level, the students were asked to report the frequency (on a five-point scale) with which they committed the following acts: (1) late arrival to class; (2) copying during exams; (3) forging of parents' signature; (4) taking from others things (e.g. books, money, audiovisual materials, etc) that do not belong to them;   (5) hitting other students/people; (6) destroying things/school furniture; (7) burning and tearing school textbooks: (8) writing slogans (graffiti) on the walls against teachers/others; (9) smoking on school grounds; and (10) causing destruction to the property of teachers and other persons.

An item inter-correlation analysis of the forms of violence demonstrated that all the 10 items were positively inter-correlated and the 44 correlations were statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Items 2,3,4 and 9 were combined to form an index of "school deviance;" items 6,7,8 and 10 were combined to form an index of 'violence against property" (vandalism); and item 5 was used independently as an index of "violence against persons."   The present analysis focuses only on the second index, "violence against property" ("vandalism') as the principal dependent variable on the level of the students.

C.   Statistical Analysis. To assess the relationship between the various sociological, ecological, school, background, and psychological factors and the various forms of violence (vandalism, graffiti and occupation of schools), on the school and the student levels, the research team used the SPSS (version 9) of the Pedagogical Institute and specifically the *stepwise linear regression analysis*.   In the process, the researchers avoided the use of multiple category dummy variables as well as quantitative variables which had low tolerance, low t-values and poor distributions. Each time, a different set of independent variables was used, depending upon our theoretical expectations and the working hypotheses .   Although several independent variables were incorporated in the regression analysis (see summary description above), for the sake of brevity, the report will present only those which were statistically

---

[7] With respect to the 10-item self-esteem scale with four (agree-disagree responses) , an item inter-correlation analysis was done. All the correlations were in the expected direction, and all but one were significant on at least the 0.05 level.   A mean self-esteem score was used in the statistical analysis of the results.

The 35 item coping scale (with four categories of response) which has been constructed by faculty members of the University of Athens Department of Psychology, on the other hand, was subjected to a factor analysis (Principal Component Analysis, Equimax with Kaiser Normalization), separate for the three school levels. The upper secondary school analysis revealed 8 factors ("Support from the parents," "Denial of the problem," "Re-framing the problem," "Confronting the problem," "Withdrawal from the problem situation," "Seeking help from friends," "Resignation," and ""Displacement of the problem") and accounted for 52.3% of the variance.

significant.   Nonetheless, in order to make a more complete assessment of theory, the paper will also comment on the 'important" non-significant findings. In all cases, before the presentation of the regression analysis, there will also be a presentation of the frequency of the various forms of student behavior in order to place it in the comparative context and not do injustice to the study population.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A.1   Violence against school property-vandalism on the school level. Generally, the rates of student violence reported by the Principals fluctuated on the low levels . The means range from a low of 1.12 ("fights with students from other schools") to a high of 2.43 ("destruction of furniture, walls and toilets"), where 1 = never and 5 = very often. The writing of graffiti was also relatively high (2.38).   Generally, "violence against property" was higher than "violence against persons," as one would expect, although all forms of violence fluctuated on the low levels. Also, it can be seen that "violence against persons" was somewhat   higher on the lower levels of education, while "violence against property" (vandalism) and "graffiti" were more common among the upper secondary schools and especially the technical-vocational high schools.

The regression analysis of the vandalism scores on the upper secondary Lyceum level revealed that only three of the several independent factors entered in the equation emerged as statistically significant predictors (**See TABLE 1**). Thus, vandalism increases with size of the student population and decreases in the presence of good relations (positive school climate) between teachers and students and between the Principals and teachers.   Several other factors which were also incorporated in the regression model (e.g. level of urbanization, type of upper secondary school, number of schools with a common shelter, sq. meters of school yard space per student, presence of library facilities, operation of remedial classes, rates of school dropouts, ease of access to schools, extracurricular activities, the Principals' opinion regarding the success-failure of student government, average family income, average grades of students and several other factors relating to school climate) were not significant predictors of school vandalism.

Table 1. Regression of violence against property-vandalism scores for the upper secondary schools (Principals' Sample)

Significant predictors	Beta Coefficients
Relations between teachers and students	-0,243
Size of student population (number of students)	0,178
Relations among the Principal and teachers	-0,170

*Adjusted R Square = 0.151.

The findings on the school level suggest that impersonality (e.g. large student populations) may play a role in vandalism. Also, a negative school climate between teachers and students and between the school administration and the teachers may also aggravate the situation and increase vandalistic behavior. Thus, to check this vandalism, there is a need to reduce the size of student populations (difficult in cities where many schools operate in shifts) and also to improve the relations among the principal school factors: students, teachers and school administration. Nonetheless, circumspection is necessary in interpreting regressions as they do not demonstrate causality and it is possible that vandalistic behavior and orientations to violence may actually constitute antecedent factors.

A.2. Violence against property (vandalism) on the student level. The levels of deviance and violence on the upper secondary school level also fluctuated on low levels, consistent with the Principals' observations . The mean scores ranged from a low of 0.10 ("taking things from the teachers and others") to a high of 1.61 ("delayed arrival in class by the students"), where never = 0 and very often = 4. The three least frequent forms of student misbehavior were "taking things from the teachers and others" (0.10), "causing destruction against the property of teachers and others" (0.12) and "the writing on the walls of pejorative slogans against teachers and others" (0.30). On the other hand, the three most frequent forms of misbehavior were the "late arrival in class" (1.61), "the copying during exams" (1.50) and "smoking on school grounds" (0.84). Generally, on the student level the "deviant" forms of misbehavior are more common than "vandalism" and "violence against persons." Some forms of misbehavior, e.g. graffiti , were surprisingly low. However, one must keep in mind that the present study restricted "graffiti" to its pejorative meaning and did not include the more "positive" forms of covert communication (e.g. between students of the opposite sex) or the aesthetic forms of graffiti in an organized context.. In any case, the two frequencies, generally, may also reflect the self-report nature of data collection, which despite efforts at anonymity may bias the results.

The regression analysis of the student vandalism index (see section on methodology for the items it includes) revealed - in contrast with the school analysis - several significant predictors (**See TABLE 2) .** Among these are the following:

First, the student's perception of the fairness of punishment by significant others (e.g. teachers or fellow students) makes a difference. Thus, vandalism increases with the perception of unjust punishment by teachers and decreases with the perception of fair treatment by fellow students.

Second, and along the same lines, the experience of victimization also makes a difference. Thus, the vandalism of students increases with the reported experience of verbal, physical, sexual and stereotype/discrimination victimization.

Third, the use of substances either by significant others or by the students themselves also impacts on vandalism. Thus, vandalism increases with the reported use of substances (alcohol, tranquilizers, narcotics, tobacco) by the father and with the use of "light" drugs (e.g. codeine, amphetamine, marijuana,) and of alcohol and tobacco by the students themselves. Although the use of illegal drugs by upper secondary school students is generally low, the use of alcohol is more common and may increase in view of the increasing rate of social and family disorganization, globalization and job/market competition. This does not augur well for the future of vandalism.

Table 2. Regression of Violence against Property (Vandalism) Scores of the Upper Secondary Schools (Students' Sample)

Significant predictors	Beta Coeficients
Experience of verbal victimization	0,069
Perception of unjust punishment by teachers	0.176
Frequency of current smoking	0.122
Experience of sexual victimization	0.121
Use of "light" drugs by students in the last 12 months	0.108
Perception of fair treatment by fellow students	-0.106
Experience of bodily victimization	0.121
Use of alcohol in last 12 months	0.070
Sex (male=1, female=0)	0.070
Experience of sexual stereotype/ discrimination victimization	0.080
Average monthly family income	0.063
Level of school urbanization	0.051
Use of substances by the father	0.048
Importance of religion in student's life	-0.048

*Adjusted R square = 0.316

Fifth, four other factors - sex, level of urbanization, the importance of religion and average monthly family income - are significant predictors of vandalism. Vandalism is a more common behavior among the male than the female students. This is anticipated from the theory of differential socialization for emotional expression and is also consistent with comparative observations which have demonstrated the male student's reluctance to participate in intervention programs against bullying.

Also anticipated is the positive role of religion. Vandalism decreases with the attribution of greater significance to religion in the student's personal life. While it is not clear what dimension of "religiosity" our item taps (de Jong et

al., 1976), the increasing involvement/relevance of the Greek Orthodox Church in youth services and problems (in view of the increasing marginalization of the family) may serve to counteract youth anomia, alienation, and vandalism.

The finding regarding the impact of urbanization was not anticipated. [8] In this model, level of student vandalism is higher in the rural and semi-urban than the urban places.   However, in a bi-variate comparison, the mean vandalism score is highest in the large urban centers of Athens and Salonica (0.40) while there is hardly any difference among the lower levels of urbanization (0.37, .38 and .38) and the means are not significantly different. Possibly, the regression analysis eliminates the effects of inter-correlated factors and reveals a more genuine association,, which however needs interpretation if such a finding is replicated. Could there be a sense of differential treatment on the part of semi-urban and rural students, or a feeling of second-class citizenship which is expressed in vandalism or is it a matter of differential expression, with the semi-urban and rural students being more sincere in their responses.

Finally, the monthly family income level also makes a difference, in an unexpected way—unexpected since it does not conform to simple deprivation and the riff-raff theories of violence.. Vandalism increases with an increase in reported family income (See also Tygart, 1988 for H.S. students). In this case, the vandalism means, in a bivariate analysis of income and vandalism, increase with level of family income among six income categories (e.g. 0.26, 0.32, 0.35, 0.38, 0.40, 0.74). Moreover, the means are statistically significant (F= 8.260, p<0.000).

Again, the interpretation of the income finding is quite a challenge. Perhaps the students from the upper income categories feel that they can deviate with impunity, especially if they feel that their income status gives them more chances to have access to the power structure and not be prosecuted. Almost every year, after the Polytechnic events, several young people (of the "known unknowns") are arrested but they are always released. Second, the involvement of upper income students in vandalism may not entail risk for their social mobility progress since they already have income security. Third, higher income students could possibly come from families with higher family breakdown rates. At least in our sample, an internal analysis showed that this was not the case, when average income was calculated for 4 types of family status.   Income was higher among the intact families and lowest among families where the parents were divorced or one of them was dead. Living or not living with the parents may not be the crucial thing. Perhaps families where both parents work to secure higher incomes do not provide their children with the emotional and psychological security they need during the crucial stage of development. These children may in turn strike out blindly, searching either for parent- surrogates among fellow students or hoping that their acts of vandalism will make their parents pay more attention to their emotional and security needs. In any case, there may also be other

---

[8] The beta coefficient is positive due to the reverse scoring of level of urbanization (The higher codes were assigned to the rural places).

interpretations, which will need further validation following actual interviews with student vandals themselves.[9]

Several factors, such as academic class level, type of upper secondary school, birth order, family status, parent's education, index of joint activities among family members, perception of parental concern, perception of just treatment by family and in daily life, participation in extracurricular activities, average grade performance, amount of time devoted to study, amount of time devoted to parallel education, attending a school under a common shelter, size of student population , self esteem and coping factors were not predictors of vandalism. The non-findings with regard to the role of extracurricular activities was an unexpected outcome, since it was anticipated that involvement in creative activities would be an alternative to vandalism and other forms of violence. Perhaps there is a need for a reorganization of extracurricular activities to make them more meaningful for the students.

B. Graffiti and slogan-writing on the walls. Graffiti behavior following protest demonstrations, occupation of schools and athletic matches is a very common activity among Greek youth and among students at all levels of education—an outcome consistent with the "assembling" theory of collective behavior. On the *school level*, graffiti in a pejorative sense (writing derogatory phrases on the walls) was the second most common activity (mean = 2.38), after "destruction of school furniture, walls and toilets" (mean = 2.43) , for upper secondary school students. Conversely, on the *level of students*, the graffiti mean was quite low (0.30) (or 1.30 if we use the same coding system (1 to 5) as used in the Principal's questionnaire). The low levels of graffiti behavior among the students is a function of the statement of the question. In the student's questionnaire, the students were asked to report graffiti behavior on the walls "against teachers and other persons." If the question had been stated differently i.e. in a more neutral direction (e.g. do you write, mark paint on the walls, desks etc. and if so what…?) the results would have been quite different. Although the research team used graffiti in a pejorative sense - since the project was interested in various forms of violence - it must be recognized that the demand characteristics of the research situation (e.g. fear of possible retaliation from teachers etc.) may have suppressed the aggressive graffiti responses.

As already mentioned, graffiti behavior seems to increase with level of education . It is higher among the upper secondary school than the lower levels of education. Perhaps, it is conditioned by developmental factors. With increasing maturity ,the students become more competent in the use of

---

[9] In another regression model, where instead of the five **types** of victimization irrespective of source, the researchers used the five **sources** of victimization (e.g. teachers, fellow students, family members/relatives, known persons such as neighbors and friends, and unknown persons), the results of the regression were almost identical. In this case, vandalism increased with victimization (all types) from teachers, fellow students and also unknown persons. Victimization from parents /relatives and victimization from known persons were not significant predictors of school vandalism.

symbolic skills, and they use alternative channels for to express their aggression against others. In addition, graffiti writing in the sense used in the present research, was higher among the vocational-technical schools— schools which attracted students from the working classes with lower academic performance—although the difference between the general and the technical schools may not be statistically significant (See regression results below).

3. Graffiti and slogan writing on the walls by Upper Secondary School Students (Principals' Schools Sample)

Significant Predictors	Beta Coefficients
Relations between teachers and students	-0,214
Level of school's urbanization (urban = 1, rural=4)	-0,227
Average proportion of students who dropped out of school	0,174
Sociality-mutual respect among teachers (Factor I in school climate scale)	-0,170

*Adjusted R square = 0,187

The regression analysis on the *school (Lyceum) level* **(See TABLE 3)** revealed that only four factors which were relevant predictors of student graffiti behavior.   Good relations between students and teachers and "sociality-mutual respect among teachers" (social climate) were inversely associated with graffiti behavior (the better the school atmosphere, the less the graffiti reported by the school Principal). On the other hand, more graffiti behavior was reported for schools situated in urban centers and with higher proportion of school dropouts. Most of the factors entered in the regression on graffiti (e.g. type of Lyceum, number of schools under common shelter, size of student population, presence of library facilities, presence of remedial classes, organization of extracurricular activities, success/failure of student government as judged by the Principals, average family income of the students, occupation of schools , operational problems of schools and several factors relating to school climate) were not relevant predictors of graffiti behavior. Again, the failure to find inverse associations with the indicators of the more legitimate activities in schools (e.g. participation of students in extracurricular activities, success/failure of student government etc.) represented a refutation of our working hypotheses. On the school level, it seems that student graffiti is largely an urban phenomenon. In Greece, eruptions of collective violence and also aggressive sports graffiti have been observed after football games, especially in large cities. This, probably, is consistent with the ecological theory. Also, the fact that there was no association with income categories suggests that graffiti behavior is a form of collective fad behavior—which perhaps satisfies students' motivations which

cannot be satisfied by the organized forms of school activity-at least not the way they are organized under the present school curriculum.

Table 4. Graffiti and slogans on the walls against teachers and other persons (Students' Sample)

Significant Predictors	Beta Coefficients
Perception of unjust punishment by the teachers	0.190
Frequency of current smoking by students	0.118
Experience of bodily victimization	0.128
Perception of fair treatment by fellow students	-0.138
Use of "light" drugs by students	0.119
Experience of sexual victimization	0.105
Frequency of punishment by parents	0.075
Use of alcohol by student during the last 12 months	0.084
Previous years average grade	0.099
Average hours per week devoted to study	-0.076

*Adjusted R square = 0.228

The regression analysis of student graffiti on the *student level* used the same combination of potential predictors as in the case of vandalism (**See TABLE 2**), since the graffiti item was also a component item in the student's vandalism score. Performing a separate regression analysis on the graffiti item, we noted generally a replication of results, with some differentiation. First, the perception of unfair treatment by teachers and fellow students seems to induce graffiti behavior. Perhaps, aggressive graffiti represents a form of vindictive response to a negative evaluation by teachers which the author of the graffiti considers unjust. Punishment by parents seems to impact in a comparable way on graffiti writing. Second, substance use (smoking, alcohol and light drugs) by the students also predicts graffiti behavior. Third, the history of certain types of victimization (sexual and physical violence) also tends to predict graffiti behavior among students.

In the graffiti analysis, we also observed some findings which were not observed in the vandalism analysis. First, higher average grades also predicted graffiti, although the finding was not anticipated and a bivariate analysis of grades and mean graffiti scores did not reveal any significant linear pattern in the same direction. Second, the average number of hours devoted to study per week seems to discourage graffiti writing; i.e. graffiti may be an occupation of the less serious students. Third, the sex -factor (male-female), although a predictor of vandalism was not a significant predictor of graffiti behavior, suggesting that there is less sexual typing socialization regarding graffiti than vandalism. Several factors used in the

regression on student's score (e.g. other types of victimization, grade in school, family status, birth-order, parent's education, joint activities with the family, use of substances by the father, participation in extracurricular activities, hours devoted to parallel informal education, importance of religion, family income, self-esteem , school shift and factors of coping) were also not significant predictors of graffiti behavior.

C. Occupation of Schools by students. The data for school occupations came only from the schools'/Principals' questionnaire (For a sociological analysis at the student level see Gotovos, 1996). Occupation of upper secondary schools (Lycea) in the present study was relatively rare between the 1991/92 and 1997/98 school years . During that period, the proportion of schools under occupation by students fluctuated between 19.2% (in 1993/94) and 41,3%(1997/98).   Moreover, the duration of the occupations for the corresponding years fluctuated between a mean low of 1.63 days (1993/94) and mean high of 3.97 days (in 1997/98).   The picture changed radically during the crucial educational reforms school year (1998/99) when the new examination system came into existence.   During the crucial school-year (1998/99),   the number of upper secondary schools under occupation increased almost geometrically (89%) and the mean duration of occupations was 17.6 days.[10] The number of days that schools were under occupation varied between 1 and 60 days. School occupations were of longer duration in the general lycea than in the technical vocational schools—the general lycea attract higher caliber and university-oriented students—at least that's what the analysis of means (if not the regression analysis) suggests. The duration of the occupations was unprecedented and caused the government to "extend" the school-year and also make cuts on the text pages for entrance examinations to the universities.

The low frequency of schools in the non-occupation category (19 out of 208 in the sample) did not allow the research team to perform a statistical analysis of the differentiating characteristics of the schools occupied and those not occupied. Instead, the team performed regression on **the duration of occupation** scores   As can be seen in Table 5, only two of several factors were significant predictors of the duration of school occupations. Duration of school occupations increased with increased level of urbanization and decreased in the presence of good relations between teachers and parents. The urban setting creates the conditions for more political and partisan differentiation   and also allows for greater intervention of party politics (through corresponding youth organizations) in schools and student activities through the youth wings of the various parties. School occupations were overtly supported by opposition parties who seek to broaden their recruitment base. In addition, Athens as the capital and the seat of the federal government provides unlimited opportunities for publicity and national media coverage of issues.

---

[10] The schools not under occupation were coded as zero days. Thus, the mean also takes into account the schools under occupation and the schools not under occupation.

5. Regression analysis of school occupation duration (in days) scores of upper secondary Greek schools (Principals' Sample).

Significant Predictors	Beta Coefficients
School's level of urbanization (urban=1, rural =4)	-0,315
Relations between teachers and parents	-0,243

*Adjusted R-square = 0.171

D. An empirical note on the relation of school occupations to other forms of student violence, with special reference to vandalism.   A vital question -with both theoretical and practical significance -   is whether occupations of schools can be considered as a legitimate form of protest for student grievances. In the introduction, we reviewed the literature whereby students tend to view occupations as strike surrogates.   No doubt the case for such an alternative can be strengthened if it can be demonstrated that the occupation of schools is not accompanied by other forms of violence and especially by vandalism.   To assess this relationship, the research team performed an inter-correlation analysis for the various indices of violence, collective and non-collective, using the data from the Principal's questionnaire and two samples of schools—the lower (Gymnasium) and the higher (Lyceum) secondary schools (**See TABLES 6 and 7**).

6.   School occupations, violence and vandalism—A Pearson intercorrelation analysis (Gymnasium Principals' Sample, N = 83 - 141)

	Violence against persons	Van-dalism	Thefts among students	Graffiti, writing of slogans on the walls	Occu-pation of schools (In days)	Cost da-mages (in drachmas)
Violence ….....	------	.272**	.379**	.219*	.044	-.082
Van-dalism….		------	.291**	.435**	.196*	.319**
Thefts ….....			------	.403**	.173*	.199
Graffiti ….				------	.180*	.418**
Occupatio ns--					------	.131
cost da-mages…						------

* p <.05   **p <.01

The outcomes vary depending of the level of education.   If we focus on the lower secondary level (**Table 6**) and the correlations pertaining to occupations of schools (column 5), we conclude that for the gymnasium level, there are

significant and positive correlations between the duration of school occupations and vandalism, theft between students and graffiti behavior. The longer the occupations last, the more frequent the acts of vandalism, theft and graffiti writing among the students. Duration of occupations was not associated with acts of violence against persons or with the costs of estimated damages. However, on the level of the upper secondary schools (**Table 7**), with the exception of the significant association with between occupations and graffiti, duration of school occupation is not associated with violence against persons, vandalism, thefts or estimated cost of damages.

The findings are difficult to interpret, especially since the school Principals were not asked to report if they observed violence during the specific occupations. Instead, they had been asked to report acts of violence, theft, vandalism, damages, and graffiti behavior during the entire school-year. Nonetheless, the difference between the two levels of education remains and calls for an interpretation. It is possible that the Gymnasium School Principals connected the forms of violence to the occupations, more than the Lyceum Principals. Also, if we assume that the other forms of violence occurred during the occupations, the differences can possibly be accounted for by differences in self-surveillance mechanisms with respect to outside agent provocateurs.   Outside infiltration and agitation may be more difficult to implement during the early phases of the occupation in view of the protected status of the younger Gymnasium students—whereas this kind of restraint may not operate in the case of the upper secondary schools.

7.   School   occupations,   violence   and   vandalism—A   Pearson intercorrelation analysis (Lyceum Principals' Sample, N = 111-180)

	Violence against per-sons	Van-dalism	Thefts among students	Graffiti, writing of slogans on the walls	Occu-pation of schools (In days)	Cost da-mages (in drachmas)
Vio-lence..	------	.308**	.200**	.161*	-.070	-.006
Van-dalism		------	.392**	.509**	.086	.304**
Theft			------	.246**	.066	.155
Graffiti				------	.213**	.223**
Occupations					------	.165
Cost da-mages						------

* p <.05   **p<.01

Nonetheless, the absence of a correlation between duration of occupation and vandalism and other forms of violence on the upper secondary level *does not mean that school occupations are exonerated and can constitute*

legitimate forms of student protest. Vandalism and damages may occur at any stage of the school occupation process, could precipitate a public outcry and could lead to the intervention of the Attorney General and the interruption of the occupation. Or it can occur at later stages of the occupation period since the Attorney General and the police do not usually intervene until there are damages. A more accurate answer can be given if one compares the schools under occupation and those not under occupation with regard to their violence scores. Doing this for the upper secondary schools (Lycea) , we observed that 8 of the 9 means were in the expected direction, i.e. higher violence against persons, vandalism, thefts among students, graffiti, and costs of damages were noted among the schools under occupation than among those not under occupation. However, due to the paucity schools not under occupation (19), only one mean difference was statistically significant (the one regarding "the destruction of organs, maps, books and school infrastructure.). Specifically, the 6 schools not under occupation during the 1998/99 school year had estimated damage costs amounting to an average of 78,000 drachmas, while the 185 schools under occupation had estimated costs amounting to 573,504 drachmas. The means trend suggests that occupations of schools is associated with other forms of violence and can not constitute an unequivocal form of student protest. However, before this conclusion can be definitive and before we can say that occupations caused/produced the violence and the damages, there is a need to assess the relationship with larger samples but to also unravel the causes by doing longitudinal studies since the possibility cannot be excluded that violence prone schools also induced the school occupations.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Taking into consideration the increasing prevalence and incidence of school violence in many western countries, the research team wanted first to record the various forms of school violence in Greece and in turn attempt to account for it in terms of background, demographic, psychological, ecological, school climate factors, using as a guide the comparative literature. The ultimate purpose of the research project was to suggest measures for preventing violence it before it reached disturbing dimensions.

The research team used a two-stage stratified random sampling (type of school and level of urbanization). Taking into account the variance in violence and school protest across school levels, and the higher rates of violence and collective protest in higher school levels, we undersampled the lower (e.g. elementary school and lower secondary gymnasium schools) and oversampled the higher secondary lyceum schools in order to achieve a more systematic test of our working hypothesis. The final sample of schools included 65 elementary schools, 153 lower secondary gymnasium schools, and 208 upper secondary lyceum schools.

Besides the sample of schools, samples of students were selected systematically from the sampled schools, 5 students from each school for the last grade of elementary school (N=309) , 5 students from each school for the

last grade of the lower secondary gymnasium schools (N= 767) and 9 students from each school (three students from each of the three grades) for the upper secondary Lyceum schools (N=1850).

The data were collected using separate questionnaires for the school level and the student level. The questionnaires were administered by teachers in the social sciences to the Principals (for the school level) and to the students themselves (student level).

The present paper focuses on the analysis of student vandalism, school occupations and graffiti behavior by students on the upper secondary Lyceum level.   Student vandalism and graffiti behavior of students were analyzed both on the school and the student levels, while school occupations were analyzed only on the level of schools.   The data were analyzed using the SPSS (version 9) and the stepwise regression analysis. The principal findings were the following:

A. Destruction of School Property-School vandalism. School vandalism on both the school and the student levels, fluctuated on the low levels. Generally, violence against persons was higher in the lower levels of education while violence against property (vandalism) and graffiti were more common in the upper secondary schools and especially the technical vocational schools.

On the **school level**, the size of the school population and the social climate of the school emerged as significant predictors of school vandalism. A larger student population and the presence of bad relations between the Principal and the teachers and between the teachers and the students predicted school vandalism.

On the *student* **level**, several factors -- student's perceptions of unfair punishment/treatment by teachers/fellow students, the experience of various types of victimization, the use of substances by significant others or the students themselves, the non significance of religion in the student's life, a non-urban background, a higher family income and   the sex variable (males) were associated with school vandalism.

Many of the above outcomes regarding the impact of the size of student population, the social climate of the school, the experiences of the students (e.g. their perceptions of treatment, their victimization, etc.), the significance of religion to the student's life, the greater participation of males in vandalism etc. were anticipated and some of them (e.g. in regard to school size, types of discipline) have also been observed in the comparative literature. Others, such as the outcomes regarding urbanization and the family income were not anticipated although also observed in some studies abroad require further exploration.

B. The Graffiti behavior of students. Graffiti behavior on the school level was more frequent than violence against persons. Also, more graffiti behavior by students was reported by the Principals than the students themselves.

This was a function of the operational specification of the graffiti question which focused on the pejorative aspects of graffiti (slogans and negative remarks against teachers and other persons).

The regression analysis of graffiti behavior on the **school** level revealed four significant factors. An urban setting, a high proportion of school dropouts, the absence of "sociality and mutual respect among the teachers" (factor from social climate scale) and the presence of bad relations between teachers and students increased the probability of students engaging in negative graffiti behavior.

On the **student** level, the regression analysis generally replicated the results of the vandalism analysis, since the graffiti question was also a component factor in the total vandalism score. Thus, perceptions of unfair treatment by teachers and fellow students, experiences of personal victimization, and substance abuse by the students were significant predictors of graffiti behavior. The outcomes suggest that engaging in graffiti behavior may represent a form of retaliation and constitute an important tension-reduction mechanism for students in a highly competitive school environment..

Unlike the vandalism results, the average grades of the students were significant positive predictors of graffiti, while the number of hours devoted to study per week were negative predictors of graffiti behavior. This sounds contradictory since a relationship exists between the two predictors. Perhaps, the students who devote much time to study do not want to risk their careers if they are discovered or perhaps there is a differential suppression of response.

Finally, the sex variable was not a predictor of graffiti behavior. Graffiti is not an overt form of vandalism (at least not as overt as that involving destruction of property) and seems more independent of the sex-linked socialization processes.

C. School occupations. Occupation of schools - especially of the upper secondary Lycea schools -- was very common during the 1998-99 school year—the first year of the full implementation of the new educational reforms. About 89% of the upper secondary schools in Greece were under occupation. The school occupations ranged from 0 to 60 days and the average duration for the 208 upper secondary schools was 17.6 days.

A regression analysis of the duration of occupation revealed only two significant predictors. School occupations were predicted by level of urbanization and the presence of bad relations between teachers and parents. The combination of urbanization with the capital functions – whereby all the federal government services are situated in the Athens area- may invite confrontations between the government and opposition/minority parties as well as interventions by the latter on behalf of mass grass-root movements such as the student movement in order to broaden their recruitment bases. The infiltration of adult party politics in the youth

movements, as well as the historical connection of student occupations (protest)with the restoration of democracy and the conception of students as future workers may also constitute additional factors that give student occupations in Greece a special intensity

Although school occupations are viewed by student protagonists as a form of legitimate protest (students as future workers, occupations as a strike-surrogate for students), it was thought that its "legitimacy" as a protest tactic would be safeguarded if it was not associated with vandalism and other forms of student violence. Duration of occupation was associated with some forms of violence on the lower secondary level but not in the upper secondary level (except for graffiti). However, this is not the crucial test. A more decisive test - comparing occupied with non-occupied schools on various indices of violence revealed higher rates of violence among the occupied schools on all indices of violence (against persons, against property-vandalism, thefts, graffiti) suggesting that school occupations are associated with violent forms of behavior and cannot constitute a legitimate form of student protest. Nonetheless, even this conclusion must be tentative due to the skewed distribution of school occupations and the uncertainty in the causal direction.

The above represent a brief overview and commentary of the regression "findings." Some of the non-findings on both the school and the student levels may also deserve commentary and interpretation. Our expectation of an inverse association between legitimate school activities (e.g. extracurricular activities, success/failure of the student government etc.) and illegal student activities (e.g. vandalism, occupation of schools, graffiti behavior) was not confirmed. The dis-confirmation may represent a failure of educational planning in regard to the purposes and functions of these activities for promoting the political socialization of students. Perhaps, the impact of extracurricular activities is reduced in a largely centralized educational system, with an overloaded curriculum and with a dual educational system (formal and parallel education). Perhaps there is a need for a re-organization of these activities on a new basis in order to make them more effective alternatives for students.

In conclusion, we cannot say that the present study accounts for "all the variance" in school violence. Also, we cannot say that the regressions (correlations) have any causal significance, until further exploration with other tools. Nonetheless, the present research project suggests that if we want to prevent school violence we need to adopt a systemic approach as most writers on intervention programs recommend. First, we should perhaps look at the family and school experiences of these young people. We should especially examine those conditions (types of punishment and treatment, forms of evaluation of students) which produce feelings of inequity among students. Secondly, we should look at the structure and nature of relations among the various school factors, including the school administration, the teachers, the students, the parents, the staff, and the surrounding community. Thirdly, there is need for the government to accelerate the establishment of compensatory services for large schools, including counseling services and individualized approaches to learning in view of the increasing scale of things.

Finally, there is a need to continue if not intensify efforts to reorganize extra-curricular activities in order to make them more effective alternatives to school violence. These school policies are especially crucial in view of the challenges and diminishing role of family institutions and may help to prevent and forestall forms of school violence which in some countries have attained explosive dimensions.

V. BIBIOGRAPHY

General Secretariat for Youth (1999), "Values, Attitudes and Perceptions of Greek Youth" (In Greek), Survey by Institute V-Project Research Consulting, Athens, October-November 1999.

Georgas, D. (1999), "The psychological dimensions of the modern family," Greek Review of Social Research, v. A'-B' 1999.

Gold, V. & Chamberlein L. J., (1996), "School/student violence: A primer," American Secondary Education, v. 24(no.3):27-32.

Goldstein, A. P., (1996),   "The psychology of vandalism," New York and London: Plenum Press.

Gotovos, A. E., (1996), "School Occupations: An unorthodox form of student protest," Gutenberg Pedagogical Series, Athens.

Haynes, R. M. & Chalker, D. M. (1999), "A nation of violence," The American School Board Journal, v. 186(no. 3):22-5.

Hellman, D.A. & Beaton, S. (1986), "The pattern of violence in urban public schools: The influence of school and community," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, v. 23(no.2):102-127.

Hoy, W. K. & Clover, S.I.R. (1986), Elementary school climate: A revision of the OCDQ, Educational Adminstration Quarterly, v. 22: 93-110.

Kalogridi, S. (1995), "School failure, low self-esteem and juvenile delinquency (In Greek), Journal of Modern Education, v. 82-83 (May-Aug):157-163.

Kanakis, Th. N., (1996), Destruction of school books: A preliminary exploration, Athens.

Kavouri, R. & Ellis, D., (1996),   "Factors affecting school climate in Greek primary schools," Concord, v. 6 (no.2):12-31.

Krauss, R. M. et al., (1996), "Field and laboratory studies of littering," In A. P. Goldstein (Ed), The psychology of vandalism, pp. 273-291.

Ley, D. and Cybriwsky,   R.   (1996), "The spatial ecology of stripped cars," In A. P. Goldstein (Ed.), The psychology of vandalism, New York and London: Plenum Press.

Lowenstein, L.F. (1986), "Vandalism in schools: causes, prevention and treatment," Health at School, v. 2(no.3):72-73.

McLean, M. M., (1996), "It's a 'blackboard jungle' out there or is it?" The Education Digest, v. 61 (Jan.):4-7.

Miller, D. L., (1989), Introduction to collective behavior, Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.

Moore, L. Watson, (1998), "Leadership theory and student violence: is there a relationship?" NASSP Bulletin, v. 82 (Mar.):50-5.

Morrison, D.R. et al, (1998), "From 'kilroy is here' to the Jonesboro incident: a logical progression," Journal of International Psychology, v. 4(December):250-5.

Morrison, G.M. and D'Incau, B., (1997), "The web of zero tolerance: characteristics of students who are recommended for expulsion from school," Education and Treatment of Children, v. 20(Aug.):316-35.

Mynard, H. and Joseph, S. (1997), "Bully-victim problems and their association with Eysenck's personality dimensions in 8 to 13 year olds," The British Journal of Educational Psychology, v. 67(Mar.):51-4.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), (1997) Violence and Discipline Problems in U.S. Public Schools, 1996-97.

Olweus, D., (1995), "Peer abuse or bullying at school: basic facts and a school-based intervention program," Prospects, v. 25(Mar.):133-139.

Pablant, P. and Baxter, J.C., (1996), "Environmental correlates of school vandalism," In A.P. Goldstein (Ed.), The psychology of vandalism, New York and London: Plenum Press.

Papademou, L., (1999), "Social and psychological analysis of the family: Results from a panhellenic demographic study "(In Greek), Psychology, v. 6(no. 2): 165-173.

Perdikis, G., (1995), "The environmental education programs: Destruction, slogans and vandalism of school buildings," Environmental Education, v. 10 (May-June):21-23.

Petropoulos, N.P. and Makrides, G., (1995), Violence in schools: A pilot study in cooperation with the municipalities of Athens, Pedagogical Institute of Greece.

Price, J.H. and Everret S.A., (1997), "Teachers' perceptions of violence in the public schools," American Journal of Health Behavior, v. 21(no. 3):172-177.

Rapti, M., (1995), "Evaluation and psychological violence in school," Journal of modern education, v. 82-83 (May-Aug.): 131-137.

Shaw-Cameron, E., (1999), "Violence: A Change agent in our schools," The Delta-Kappa-Gamma Bulletin, v. 65 (no. 2): 15-18.

Shen, J., (1997), "The evolution of violence in schools," Educational Leadership, v. 55 (oct.): 18-20.

Skiba-Russel J. et al., (1999), "The dark side of zero tolerance :can punishment lead to safe schools ?" Phi-Delta-Kappan, v. 80 (no. 5): 372-6+.

Skiba-Russel, J. and Peterson-Reese, L., (1999), "Zap zero tolerance," The Education Digest, v. 64(no.8):24-30.

Stromquist, N.P. and Diego-Vigil,J., (1996), "Violence in schools in the United States of America: Trends, causes and responses," Prospects, v. 26 (June): 361-383

Sykes, G. and Matza, D., (1957), "Techniques of Neutralization: A theory of delinquency," American Sociological Review, v. 22 (Dec.):664-670.

Tygart, C. E., (1988), "Public school vandalism: Toward a synthesis of theories and transition to paradigm analysis," v. 23 (Spring): 187-200.

Tygart, C.E., (1991), "Student interpersonal public school violence: some explanations derived from adult interpersonal of violence theory," International Journal of Group Tensions, v. 21 (no. 1): 85-99.

Vidali, S., (1995), "The transfer of societal violence to schools: student mobilization," (In Greek), Journal of Modern Education, v. 82-83 (May-Aug.):112-119.

Vitsilaki-Soroniati, Ch. (1993), "The 1990 student occupations: empirical conclusions and theoretical ramifications" (In Greek), Pace of the Social Sciences, Vol. C (No. 11): 125-165.

Vooidaskis, V. K., (1997), "Social causes of cyclical, vertical, and horizontal mutually aggressive behavior in primary socialization groups (In Greek), In I. N. Nestoros, " Aggressive behavior in the family, the school and in society." Greek Letters, Athens, pp. 52-68.

Warner, B. et al., (1999) "Risk factors for school violence," Urban Education, Vol. 34 (No. 1): 52-68.

Watson, T.S., (1996), "A prompt plus delayed contingency procedure for reducing bathroom graffiti," Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, v. 29 (no. 1): 121-24.

Weishew, N. L. and Peng, S. S., (1993), "Variables predicting students' problem behaviors," Journal of Educational Research, v. 87 (no. 1): 5-17.

Workman, M. and Beer, J., (1992), "Depression, suicide ideation, and aggression among high school students whose parents are divorced and use alcohol at home," Psychological Reports, v. 70 (no. 2):503-511.

Yohji, M., "Bullying as a contemporary behavioral problem in the context of increasing 'societal privatization' in Japan," Prospects, v. 26 (June):311-29.

Zwier G. And Vaughan, G. M., (1998), "Three ideological orientations in school vandalism research," Review of Education Research, v. 54 (2): 263-292.

"Protest and Violence in Greek Schools, with Special Reference to Upper Secondary Schools"

(Abstract)

School violence is increasingly becoming a social problem for western and other democracies. In Greece, the problem has not yet assumed the disturbing proportions in has in some other countries. A research team from the Pedagogical Institute, using the comparative literature as a guide, decided to conduct a study of the background, family, individual, ecological and school factors and their relation to school violence with a view to making recommendations for intervention and prevention programs.

A two stage stratified random sampling of Greek schools (by type and level of urbanization), with over-sampling of the upper levels, was used to assure a representative sampling of schools and to systematically test our working hypothesis. The present study used a sample of 208 upper secondary schools and 1850 upper secondary students who were systematically selected from the sampled schools. Different questionnaires were constructed and completed either by the Principal of the school (school level) or by the students (student level). The data of the study were analyzed, using the SPSS (version 9) and stepwise regression.

Generally, school vandalism and graffiti behavior fluctuated on low levels. This was surprising for graffiti since it is very widespread in Greek educational institutions. In addition, there was a difference in the reporting of graffiti behavior by the Principals and the students—a difference with was attributed mainly to the operational definition of graffiti and the demand characteristics of the school environment. Conversely, school occupations, which a substantial minority of the students considers as a form of "legitimate" protest (surrogate tactic for workers' strikes) were very prevalent (89%) during the 1998-99 school year—a school year which coincided with the educational reforms.

The regression analysis of school vandalism, graffiti and duration of school occupations ,on both the school and student levels, revealed that such factors as the size of the student population, the school climate, the level of urbanization, the students' perceptions of punishment/treatment by teachers and fellow students, the experience of victimization by the students, the use of substances by significant others and the students themselves, the sex of the students, the student's grades, the hours per week devoted to study, the family income were significant predictors of either vandalism, graffiti or occupation of schools. The absence of a negative association between organization of and participation in legitimate extracurricular activities and the various forms of school violence calls for further exploration.

The paper concludes with an empirical note on school occupations as a form of "legitimate" student protest , with a discussion of methodological limitations, as well as with policy recommendations (e.g. paying attention to the socialization and treatment of young people, increasing school services, re-organizing extracurricular activities, etc.) in accord with the systemic model for preventing school violence in the context of the diminishing role of the family institutions in post industrial societies.

N. Petropoulos
Pedagogical Institute of Greece