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Abstract
Different studies show the relationship between peer violence and teen dating violence. However, more knowledge is needed about this relationship. The aim of this study was to explore possible differences in peer violence (perpetrated and suffered) in adolescents with different role in teen dating violence (aggressor, victim, aggressor-victim, and not involved). The initial sample was composed of 1078 adolescents, but for the purposes of this study, only those students who had a partner in the last year were considered, 672 students (51.6% girls) aged 12-18 years (M= 14.45, SD= 1.62). These adolescents completed the CADRI scale, the VE-I peer victimization scale, and the violent behavior scale by Little et al. (2003). The results indicated that peer violence victimization and perpetration were closely related to dating abuse (victimization and perpetration) in adolescents. Students with frequent aggressor-victim role in partner relationships showed more peer violence behaviors. Girls victims of teen dating violence were more victimized by their classmates. These results show a strong relationship between these two problems, which seriously affect the well-being of adolescents.
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Resumen
Diferentes estudios evidencian la relación entre la violencia entre iguales y de pareja en adolescentes. Sin embargo, se precisa mayor conocimiento sobre ellas. El objetivo de este estudio fue explorar posibles diferencias en violencia entre iguales (ejercida y sufrida) en adolescentes con diferente rol en la violencia de pareja (agresor, víctima, agresor-victima y no implicado). La muestra inicial estuvo compuesta por 1078 adolescentes, pero para los propósitos del estudio se consideró a los que tuvieron pareja en el último año, 672 adolescentes (51,6% chicas) entre 12-18 años (M= 14,45; DT= 1,62). Estos adolescentes completaron la escala CADRI, la escala VE-I de victimización entre iguales y la escala de conducta violenta de Little et al. (2003). Los resultados indicaron que la victimización y violencia entre iguales estaba relacionada con el abuso de pareja. El alumnado con rol frecuente de agresor-victima en la pareja mostraba más violencia entre iguales. Las chicas víctimas de violencia de pareja eran más victimizadas por sus compañeros. Estos resultados evidencian una fuerte relación entre estas problemáticas, que afectan gravemente al bienestar de los adolescentes.
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Introduction

Teen dating violence and peer violence have a very negative impact on the psychological and social well-being of the students who suffer or exercise it, and have very negative consequences in the school environment (Foshee et al., 2016; Garandeau et al., 2021; Idsoe et al., 2021). Both types of violence make it difficult to educate students in the values of respect and peaceful coexistence (Arslan, 2021; Avilés et al., 2019). Teen dating violence is defined as physical, sexual, psychological or emotional violence within a couple relationship (Cutter-Wilson & Richmond, 2011). Peer violence in the school environment is defined as aggressive behavior carried out intentionally and repetitively by some students against another classmate, in a context of imbalance of power between aggressor/s and victim, which generates in the student beset feelings of helplessness (Olweus, 2013). This violence can be exercised directly, through physical and verbal aggression, such as insults, blows or kicks, and indirectly, through social rejection and isolation of the victim (Crick & Grotpeter, 1996; Marini et al., 2006).

As evidenced by current studies, a further training of students on values, attitudes, and appropriate behaviors in their relationships with peers and with the couple is essential (Cava et al., 2022; Ferreira-Junior et al., 2023; Muñoz et al., 2013), given the high incidence of these types of violence among adolescents and their serious consequences (Beckmeyer et al., 2020; Muñoz-Fernández, et al., 2019). Adolescents begin their first romantic relationships with an evident lack of experience in this type of relationship, which generates frequent conflicts, jealousy and insecurities, which they do not always know how to handle and that can favor verbal aggressions to the partner (Viejo, 2014). According to the report prepared by Save The Children (2021), 25% of adolescents aged 16 and 17 suffer psychological and control violence from their partner, while the study by Richards & Branch (2012) indicates that 23% of adolescents have perpetrated dating violence. Different studies show that frequency of verbal mutual aggression in adolescent couples is very high (Carrascosa et al., 2016; Cucci et al., 2020; Debnam & Mauer, 2021; González-Cordero et al., 2020); while physical aggressions are less frequent (Cucci et al., 2020). Moreover, peer violence is also a frequent problem that raises great social concern in parents and teachers. Specifically, Modecki et al. (2014) found a prevalence of 36% for victimization and 35% for aggression in peer violence. These data show the need to investigate and prevent these problems that affect the positive psychosocial development of students and hinder the peaceful coexistence in the classroom.

Recently, some studies have confirmed the existence of relationships between teen dating violence and peer violence in students (Cava et al., 2021; Hunt et al., 2022; Valdivia-Salas et al., 2021; Viejo et al., 2020). In this regard, the meta-analytical study by Zych et al. (2021) shows that teen dating violence and peer violence perpetration are related, as well as the peer violence perpetration and teen
dating violence victimization. However, peer victimization has not previously been related to teen dating violence perpetration. Furthermore, longitudinal studies show that relationships between teen dating violence and peer violence in adolescence are maintained over time (Foshee et al., 2014; Miller et al., 2013). Nevertheless, studies on the links between both types of violence should be expanded, since there is little research that analyzes the dual role (victim-aggressor) in teen dating violence in relation to peer violence victimization and perpetration, nor the frequency of this violence, that is, whether it is performed occasionally or frequently has been considered. This differentiation is important, since while occasional mutual aggressions have little impact on the well-being of adolescents and are related to their difficulties in resolving interpersonal conflicts and their inexperience in partner relationships (Viejo, 2014, 2020), frequent mutual aggressions are usually indicative of more serious problems in personal, school and social adjustment (Carrascosa et al., 2016).

Regarding differences between boys and girls, Cucci et al. (2020) observed that girls perform more verbal-emotional and physical violence behaviors toward their partners and Vives-Cases et al. (2021) indicated that the victimization of this type of abuse is more prevalent in girls. By contrast, González-Cordero et al. (2020) reported a higher percentage of boys than girls involved in teen dating violence, both exercised and suffered. Regarding peer violence, there is also no consonance among different studies. Some studies indicate that boys participate more in violent behaviors and suffer more school peer victimization (Carrascosa et al., 2015; Sentse et al., 2015), while other authors point to a greater tendency of girls to be victims and boys to be aggressors (Özer et al., 2011; Save the Children, 2021). These studies, although they do not provide conclusive results on gender differences, do clearly show the need to include in the research the dual role of aggressor-victim, present in many adolescent couples, and its relationship with peer violence victimization and perpetration. In addition, previous scientific literature has indicated gender differences in violent behavior and school victimization among peers (Avilés-Dorantes et al., 2012; Carrascosa et al., 2015), as well as teen dating violence in adolescents (González-Cordero et al., 2020; Vives-Cases et al., 2021). Therefore, it is necessary to analyze the differences between boys and girls.

Considering the importance of deepening the knowledge of the relationships between teen dating violence and peer violence, this research was conducted. The objectives of this study were: (1) to analyze the correlations between teen dating violence (exercised and suffered), and peer violence (exercised and suffered); (2) analyze the prevalence of adolescent victims, aggressors and victim-aggressors in their partner relationships, taking into account whether the involvement in these behaviors is occasional or frequent; (3) explore possible differences in peer violence (exercised and suffered) in adolescent students with different roles in teen dating violence: "not involved", "victims", "aggressors", "occasional aggressive victims" (occasional victim-aggressor dual role) and "frequent aggressive victims" (frequent victim-aggressor dual role). In addition, these analyzes will be carried out separately with boys and girls. As initial hypotheses, these were proposed: (1) There are positive correlations, in boys and girls, between perpetrated peer violence and perpetrated teen dating violence, and between suffered peer violence and suffered teen dating
violence; (2) The prevalence of "occasional aggressive victim" is higher than the prevalence of "victims," "aggressors," and "frequent aggressive victims" in teen dating violence; (3) Adolescent boys and girls who are "occasional aggressive victims" and "not involved" in teen dating violence show lower scores in peer violence (exercised and suffered), compared to adolescents who have a greater involvement in teen dating violence ("aggressors", "victims", and "frequent aggressive victims").

Method

Participants

This study involved 1,078 students (545 boys, 533 girls), aged 12 to 18 years (boys: \(M = 14.33\), \(SD = 1.50\), girls: \(M = 14.57\), \(SD = 1.73\)) from four centers of Secondary Education (two public and two private-subsidized) in the Valencian region (Spain). These students were studying Secondary Education: 1st grade (\(n = 227\)), 2nd grade (\(n = 261\)), 3rd grade (\(n = 234\)), and 4th grade (\(n = 220\)); and pre-University studies: 1st grade (\(n = 85\)) and 2nd grade (\(n = 51\)). 89.9% of the adolescents were born in Spain, and most lived with both parents (77.7%). 14.9% reported living with the mother, 2.7% with the father, 3.8% living with the father and one time with the mother, and .9% living with other relatives. Most adolescents (56.8%) had one sibling, 18.6% were only children, 15.9% had two siblings and 8.7% reported having three or more siblings. Their socioeconomic status was medium, or medium-low.

All of them completed the scales that evaluate school peer violence (perpetration and victimization), but only those students who indicated that they had at that time, or had had in the previous 12 months, a dating relationship completed the scale of teen dating violence. If they had had several dating relationships in the last 12 months, they were instructed to respond thinking about their last relationship. Also, they were reported that the relationship should have lasted longer than a single date, to be considered as a dating relationship. The final sample consisted of 672 students, 347 girls (51.6%) and 325 boys (48.4%), aged 12 to 18 years (boys: \(M = 14.36\), \(SD = 1.48\), girls: \(M = 14.70\), \(SD = 1.65\)). Taking their age into account, the percentages were as follows: 9.2% were 12 years old (\(n = 62\)), 20.68% were 13 years old (\(n = 139\)), 20.83% were 14 years old (\(n = 140\)), 22.02% were 15 years old (\(n = 148\)), 16.07% were 16 years old (\(n = 108\)), 7.4% were 17 years old (\(n = 49\)) and 3.8% were 18 years old (\(n = 26\)).

Instruments

a) Ad hoc sociodemographic questionnaire. The participants first answered several sociodemographic questions: sex (boy and girl), age, grade, school, country in which they were born, with whom they lived and number of siblings.

b) Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationship Inventory (CADRI; Wolfe et al., 2001). The original scale is composed of 70 items, 35 items that evaluate the violence perpetrated and 35 items that explore the violence suffered. Each of these
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subscales evaluates the following dimensions: relational, verbal-emotional, physical, sexual violence/victimization and threats. For this research, three subscales of teen dating violence perpetrated (17 items) were used: (1) Relational violence perpetrated, composed of 3 items (e.g., "I said things to his/her friends about him/her to put them against him/her"), (2) Verbal-emotional violence perpetrated, including 10 items (e.g., "I insulted him/her with contempt phrases") and (3) Physical violence perpetrated, 4 items (e.g., "I pushed him/her or shook him/her"). In addition, three subscales of teen dating violence suffered (17 items) were also used: (1) Relational violence suffered, including 3 items (e.g., "Tried to get away from my group of friends"), Verbal-emotional violence suffered, with 10 items (e.g., "He ridiculed or mocked me in front of others") and Physical violence suffered, with 4 items (e.g., "He slapped me"). Adolescents answered these items with a range from 1 (never) to 4 (often). The reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) of these subscales in this research was .65 for relational violence perpetrated, .85 verbal-emotional violence perpetrated, .86 physical violence perpetrated, .91 relational violence suffered, .64 verbal-emotional violence suffered, and .82 physical violence suffered. Both total scale of violence perpetrated and total scale of violence suffered showed a reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) of .91.

c) Violent Behavior in School Scale (Little et al., 2003). This scale is composed of 25 items that explore violence toward peers at school. It consists of two subscales: (1) Overt violence, which includes 13 items describing direct aggression behaviors against classmates, such as insults, blows or threats (e.g., "I threaten others to get what I want") and (2) Relational violence, which includes 12 items related to indirect violence behaviors against classmates, such as spreading rumors, isolating or socially rejecting a colleague (e.g., "To get what I want, I don’t let some people be part of my group of friends"). To answer these items, students use a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) of these two subscales in this research was .83 and .76, respectively.

d) Peer Victimization Scale (“Escala de victimización escolar entre iguales”, VE-I; Cava & Buelga, 2018). This scale describes different situations of victimization that students may have suffered from their peers in school. These behaviors of violence suffered are measured through 11 items, grouped into three factors: (1) Relational Victimization (3 items), measures behaviors of isolation and social rejection suffered (e.g., "Some classmate has ignored me or left me aside to make me feel bad"); (2) Physical Victimization (4 items), related to physical aggression suffered (e.g., "Some classmate has thrown me to the ground"); and (3) Verbal Victimization (4 items), related to verbal aggressions suffered (e.g., "Some classmate has made fun of me"). The possible answers to these items ranged from 1 (never) to 4 (always). The reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) of the three subscales in this study was .90, .66 and .85, respectively.
Procedure

The selection of educational centers was made by non-probabilistic sampling of incidental type. First, a telephone contact was made with the schools to inform them about this study and to know their initial interest in having more information. Once this first contact was established and their interest confirmed, they received (by e-mail) a letter briefly describing the main objectives of the study and indicating several possible dates to have a meeting with the management team to explain the study in more detail. Once all their doubts were solved at this meeting, the four centers contacted agreed to participate in this study. The families of the students received an informative letter, in which they were asked for their informed consent for the participation of their children. This letter also informed them that their children’s participation was voluntary, that their responses to the questionnaires would be anonymous and that they could access the research team to resolve any doubts. If they did not want their children to participate, they were instructed to notify the school center by means of a short form attached to the information letter, within two weeks. Only a small percentage of families (less than 2%) indicated their desire for their children not to participate in this study. The completion of the instruments was carried out in the students' own classrooms, with the presence of members of the research team. Before completing the instruments, students were also informed of the confidentiality and anonymity of their answers and the possibility of refusing to participate. None of the adolescents refused to participate. At all times, the ethical principles set out in the Declaration of Helsinki on research involving human subjects were followed, and it was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Valencia, with the following code: H1456762885511.

Data analysis

Firstly, the reliability of scales and descriptive statistics was calculated. The percentage of data lost was very small (<0.01%), and subjects with missing data were not included in subsequent analyses. Next, the correlations among all the variables included in this study were calculated and possible differences based on gender were explored with Student's t. Because the sample has a wide age range, age-controlling partial correlation analyses were performed. Next, the total scores of adolescents on the CADRI scales of teen dating violence perpetrated and teen dating violence suffered were used to establish the different roles in teen dating violence. Specifically, the scores on these two scales were used to differentiate five different groups of adolescents: (1) "not involved": those adolescents who indicated in all the items of both scales that they had never perpetrated or suffered teen dating violence; (2) "frequent victim-aggression": adolescents with scores above \( M + 1SD \) on the scale of teen dating violence perpetrated and the scale of teen dating violence suffered; (3) "aggressors": adolescents with a score higher than \( M + 1SD \) on the scale of teen dating violence perpetrated and with a score lower than \( M + 1SD \) on the scale of teen dating violence suffered; (4) "victims": adolescents with a score above \( M + 1SD \) on the scale of teen dating violence suffered and a score below...
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M + 1 SD on the scale of violence perpetrated; and (5) "occasional aggressive victims": adolescents with scores below M + 1SD on the scales of teen dating violence perpetrated and teen dating violence suffered. Once these five groups were established, possible differences in the distribution of adolescents in these five groups according to sex (boys, girls) were analyzed. To do this, Chi-Square and V-Cramer's V were calculated. Finally, multivariate analyses were performed to explore possible differences in school peer victimization (relational, physical and verbal-emotional) and violent behaviors toward peers (overt and relational) among these five groups of adolescents with a different role in teen dating violence. These analyses were performed separately for boys and girls. All statistical analyses were performed with the statistical program SPSS-26. p values< .05 were considered statistically significant.

Results

Table 1 shows the correlations, in boys and girls, of all the variables and the analysis of the possible differences in these variables according to gender. Boys have significantly higher average scores than girls in relational teen dating violence perpetrated, relational and physical teen dating violence suffered, physical peer victimization and direct violent behavior toward peers (overt aggression); while girls' mean scores are significantly higher in verbal-emotional teen dating violence perpetrated and relational peer victimization.

Table 1 also shows significant correlations between teen dating violence perpetrated (TDVP) and teen dating violence suffered (TDVS) in boys and girls. In addition, TDVP and TDVS correlate significantly and positively with physical school peer victimization in boys and girls, and with relational and verbal-emotional school peer victimization in boys. There are also significant positive correlations of teen dating violence perpetrated (TDVP) and suffered (TDVS) with violent behavior toward peers, in boys and girls, with exception of the relationship between physical peer victimization and relational aggression toward peers, in boys, and the relationship between relational PV and overt aggression toward peers in girls.

Next (Table 2), the distribution of students (boys and girls) in the five groups established according to their different role in teen dating violence can be observed. The analyses showed significant differences between boys and girls in their distribution in these groups (χ2 = 21.843, p<.001; Cramer’s V= .196, p<.001). There is a greater number of girls assigned to the "occasional aggressor-victim" group and a lower number to the "frequent aggressor-victim" and "victim" groups. In addition, the results show that occasional aggressive victims have lower percentages compared to the groups of victims, aggressors and frequent aggressive victims (χ2 = 54.243, p< .001).
### Table 1
Means, standard deviations and correlations among variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relational TDVP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.787**</td>
<td>.795**</td>
<td>.534**</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.736**</td>
<td>.267**</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.116*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Verbal-emotional TDVP</td>
<td>.480**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.728**</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td>.708**</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.200**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical TDVP</td>
<td>.577**</td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.737**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.139**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relational TDVS</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.436**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.709**</td>
<td>.628**</td>
<td>.281**</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>.166**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Verbal-emotional TDVS</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.690**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.204**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical TDVS</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.159**</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.149**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relational PV</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>.129*</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.738**</td>
<td>.812**</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>.168**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Physical PV</td>
<td>.147**</td>
<td>.145**</td>
<td>.123*</td>
<td>.127*</td>
<td>.162**</td>
<td>.168**</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.758**</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.154**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Verbal PV</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.138*</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>.123*</td>
<td>.750**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.128*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overt VBP</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.162**</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.160**</td>
<td>.159**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.516**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Relational VBP</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.123**</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>.111*</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD) Boys</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(4.57)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td>(1.43)</td>
<td>(5.03)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td>(4.93)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td>(3.16)</td>
<td>(2.25)</td>
<td>(4.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD) Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td>(4.22)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(.953)</td>
<td>(4.31)</td>
<td>(.907)</td>
<td>(5.24)</td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(3.09)</td>
<td>(2.40)</td>
<td>(3.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t Student</td>
<td>3.95**</td>
<td>-2.44*</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>3.80**</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>3.46**</td>
<td>-3.27**</td>
<td>7.53**</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: TDVP= Teen dating violence perpetrated; TDVS= Teen dating violence suffered; PV= Peer victimization; VBP= Violent behavior toward peers. Boys above the diagonal. **p < .01; *p < .05.
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Table 2
Distribution of students according to sex and their different role in teen dating violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Not Involved</th>
<th>Occasional aggressor-victim</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Frequent aggressor victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>76 (13.32)</td>
<td>134 (23.45)</td>
<td>22 (3.87)</td>
<td>9 (1.58)</td>
<td>26 (4.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>50 (8.75)</td>
<td>205 (35.90)</td>
<td>15 (2.62)</td>
<td>15 (2.63)</td>
<td>19 (3.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126 (22.07)</td>
<td>339 (59.35)</td>
<td>37 (6.49)</td>
<td>24 (4.21)</td>
<td>45 (7.88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the differences between these five groups of students (boys and girls separately) in the variables of school peer violence (perpetrated and suffered). It is observed that children who are victims of teen dating violence and those who are frequent aggressive victims suffer more relational school peer violence than students who do not perpetrate or suffer teen dating violence or who maintain a role of occasional aggressive victims ($p < .001; \eta^2 = .093$). Frequent aggressor-victim boys also suffer more physical peer victimization than those who do not perpetrate or suffer violence (not involved) and those who are occasional aggressive victims ($p < .001; \eta^2 = .082$). Boys who are victims of teen dating violence also suffer more school peer violence, compared to those who are not involved in teen dating violence ($p = .013; \eta^2 = .049$). In addition, boys who show a frequent aggressor-victim role in their dating relationships also perform more overt aggressive behaviors toward their peers, compared to uninvolved students, those who are occasional aggressive victims and those who are victims ($p < .001; \eta^2 = .086$). Finally, those who are frequent aggressive victims in their relationship show more relational aggressive behavior toward their peers than students not involved in teen dating violence, as victims or as aggressors ($p = .002; \eta^2 = .066$).

Regarding girls (Table 3), there are also significant differences between the five established groups. Girls who are victims of violence in their dating relationship suffer more relational aggressions from their classmates than those not involved in any form of teen dating violence ($p = .026; \eta^2 = .037$), and they suffer more physical and verbal violence than uninvolved and occasional aggressive victims ($p = .001; \eta^2 = .061; p < .001; \eta^2 = .074$). Girls not involved in teen dating violence have lower scores in school peer violence toward peers, overt and relational, compared to the rest of adolescents. In contrast, girls with a frequent victim-aggressive role show the highest scores in overt peer violence ($p < .001; \eta^2 = .162$). Both girls with aggressor role and girls with frequent aggressive victims role have higher relational aggression scores, compared to uninvolved girls and occasional aggressive victims girls ($p < .001; \eta^2 = .099$).
### Table 3

Average and standard deviations in school peer victimization and violent behavior toward peers in boys and girls with different roles in teen dating violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Not involved</th>
<th>Occasional aggressor-victim</th>
<th>Frequent aggressor-victim</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School peer victimization</td>
<td>14.33 (5.06)</td>
<td>15.30 (4.68)</td>
<td>18.38 (5.40)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationa</td>
<td>5.07 (1.62)</td>
<td>5.41 (1.76)</td>
<td>5.76 (1.84)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>9.92 (3.48)</td>
<td>10.37 (2.97)</td>
<td>12.33 (3.37)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>17.65 (3.96)</td>
<td>18.12 (3.68)</td>
<td>18.76 (4.82)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent behavior</td>
<td>16.14 (3.41)</td>
<td>17.59 (3.56)</td>
<td>18.44 (3.36)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School peer victimization</td>
<td>15.45 (6.29)</td>
<td>16.64 (4.84)</td>
<td>20.14 (6.48)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationa</td>
<td>4.55 (0.765)</td>
<td>4.77 (1.13)</td>
<td>5.79 (1.53)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>9.45 (3.02)</td>
<td>10.64 (2.74)</td>
<td>13.29 (3.36)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>15.98 (3.67)</td>
<td>16.81 (3.29)</td>
<td>17.86 (3.39)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent behavior</td>
<td>15.53 (3.33)</td>
<td>17.19 (3.43)</td>
<td>18.07 (3.17)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Post-hoc Bonferroni or bcF, p < .05.
Discussion

This research was proposed with the purpose of deepening the study of the relationships between the different roles of teen dating violence and victimization and aggression among peers. This study provides interesting findings since it evidences the relationship between both problems and deepens the knowledge of the double role in teen dating violence, and in victimization and perpetration among peers in school.

Regarding the first objective, the initial hypothesis was confirmed since the results confirmed, like previous research, the existence of strong links between school peer victimization and teen dating violence victimization, suggesting a continuity in the role of victim in both types of violence (Cava et al., 2021; Espelage et al., 2022; Garthe et al., 2021). In this same line, Valdivia-Salas et al. (2021) have indicated a continuity in the role of aggressor in school peer violence and teen dating violence. In this regard, the data from this study have confirmed positive correlations between both types of violence and victimization (Cava et al., 2021; Valdivia-Salas et al., 2021; Viejo et al., 2020; Vivolo-Kantor et al., 2014); and, in addition, they have found significant correlations between the violence perpetrated and suffered, in both contexts. That is, not only positive correlations have been confirmed between peer victimization and dating violence victimization, and between violence toward peers and teen dating violence perpetrated, but also positive correlations have been found between being a victim in a specific relational context (with peers or with the partner) and being an aggressor in another relational context (peers or partner). This indicates a greater complexity in the connections between teen dating violence (and victimization) and peer violence (and victimization). The links between both relational contexts (peers and partner) would therefore go beyond a continuity in the role of aggressor or in the role of victim, being also possible continuity in the double role aggressor-victim. Future research should delve into the possible continuity of this dual role in different contexts.

In relation to the second objective of this study, the initial hypothesis was confirmed since it has been observed that most adolescents (59.35%) have an occasional aggressor-victim role in their relationships. This data coincides with other previous studies (Cava et al., 2015, 2020; Valdivia-Salas et al., 2021), which reinforces the importance of differentiating between occasional or frequent involvement in this dual role. Most adolescents have an occasional involvement in this dual role of aggressor-victim, and not differentiating it from their frequent involvement could provide inaccurate information about their dating relationships.

Regarding the third objective of the study, the results obtained have allowed to deepen the differences in violent behavior toward peers and school peer victimization among adolescents with different roles in teen dating violence, providing interesting data. First, it has been observed that there are significant differences in involvement in school peer violence between adolescents with different role in teen dating violence. The data from this study confirm that adolescents (boys and girls) with an occasional role of aggressor-victim have fewer problems of school violence and show a profile very similar to that of adolescents not involved in teen dating violence. In fact, and in the same line as previous
research, the double role of occasional aggressor-victim in the couple seems to be mainly related to their lack of experience in dating relationships and difficulties in managing the conflicts that arise in these relationships (Viejo, 2014), together with the influence of some myths of romantic love that generate emotional dependencies, jealousy and insecurities (Cava et al., 2020; Zeigler-Hill et al., 2015). In this regard, in several previous studies (Cheng et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2018), it has been observed that an occasional involvement in the dual role of aggressor-victim entails fewer negative consequences for the well-being and psychosocial adjustment of adolescents than their frequent involvement in the aggressor-victim dual role, which does have a serious negative impact on their psychosocial well-being.

In addition, adolescents (boys and girls) with a frequent role of victim-aggressor in their dating relationship are also more involved in school peer violence, with greater perpetration of aggressive behavior toward their peers, both overt and relational. These adolescents would have internalized a model of aggressive behavior, based on dominance-submission relationships (Ludin et al., 2018; Pepler et al., 2008), who would be transferring from the context of peer relationships to romantic relationships (Hong et al., 2022; Pacheco-Salazar, 2018). Likewise, the role of victim seems to be transferred from one context to another. Thus, it has been observed that boys and girls victims of teen dating violence also suffer more relational and verbal victimization by their classmates; and in the case of girls also greater physical victimization. This continuity in the role of victim highlights the need to help adolescents who suffer school peer violence to adequately cope with these situations, as a way to prevent their role as victims could be transferred to other contexts. The possible continuity in the role of victim, in the role of aggressor, or in the dual role of aggressor-victim, is an aspect that should be the subject of further research, as well as greater consideration in programs for the prevention of violence in adolescents.

Finally, some interesting differences between boys and girls have also been observed in the relationship between school peer violence and teen dating violence. Thus, in the case of boys, those with a frequent victim-aggressor role in their dating relationship reported suffering more relational and physical violence from their peers, compared to those who are not involved in teen dating violence and those who have an occasional victim-aggressor role. That is, these boys also suffer more physical aggression and greater social rejection from their peers. However, this greater victimization by partners is not observed in girls with a frequent victim-aggressive role in their dating relationship. These girls have difficulties in their relationships with their peers, because they perpetrate more behaviors of peer violence. Nevertheless, they do not suffer more peer victimization. School peer victimization could have a deeper impact on boys’ involvement in teen dating violence; although this question need to be analyzed more extensively in future studies.

This research also has some limitations. First, it is a cross-sectional study, which prevents establishing causality between the variables analyzed. For this, future longitudinal studies are required to determine the mutual influence between the variables and explore their changes over time. Also, another limitation of this study is the use of self-reports for the measurement of the variables studied, which may
promote biases related to social desirability or recall and subjective perception of some behaviors. Although the previous scientific literature shows that the measurement of these variables using self-reports is adequate, it would be advisable in future studies to include other sources of information, such as the teachers, classmates, or being able to have information from both members of the couple. Finally, another limitation of this study is the lack of information on the psychosocial adjustment of adolescents involved in both forms of violence and victimization. Future research should also assess variables indicative of their psychosocial well-being, such as life satisfaction, academic performance, social integration, or school adjustment.

However, despite these limitations, this work provides new data that may have an important useful applied to promote the integral education and well-being of adolescents. Peer relationships and first romantic relationships are essential in the development of adolescents, and the existence of violence in these relationships has a very negative impact on them. The results of this study have found important connections between both problems, peer violence and teen dating violence, highlighting how adolescents with a frequent role of aggressor-victim in their first romantic relationships also present greater difficulties in the relationships with their peers, as aggressors and as victims.

The relationships between peer violence and teen dating violence in adolescent students, clearly observed in this study, reinforce the importance of their joint attention from school contexts. Therefore, it is advisable to prevent both problems together, as is done in programs such as DARSI (Cava et al., 2022) or Dat-e adolescencia (Muñoz-Hernández et al., 2019), and promote education in values for the comprehensive development of students (Avilés et al., 2019). Although it is true that in recent decades numerous studies have been carried out on school violence and educational intervention programs have been developed to prevent these behaviors (Cerezo et al., 2011; Garandeau et al., 2021; Monjas & Avilés, 2006; Sampén-Díaz et al., 2017), the studies on teen dating violence in students are certainly fewer. From this study, it is concluded the importance of promoting in students the values, attitudes and behaviors that enable them to establish non-violent interpersonal relationships, both with their peers and in their first romantic relationships, including specific interventions with the different roles involved.
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