



*The structure of violence in the school environment as a "protest semiotics":
A study in the sociology of stigma and the erosion of social bonds.*

CHERRAK Hamza

University of Djelfa (Algeria)

Hamza.cherrak@univ-djelfa.dz

Abstract

This study examines school violence through an integrative sociological perspective, viewing it as a behavioral chain resulting from weakened emotional security and learners' alienation within the educational system. It argues that violence is not merely individual deviance but a structural reaction to systemic exclusion and symbolic violence. The findings highlight the limitations of punitive approaches and "zero tolerance" policies, which often intensify student stigmatization and deepen alienation. Consequently, the study advocates adopting the restorative justice paradigm as an alternative framework to rebuild social relationships and foster a supportive school climate that balances students' mental well-being with academic achievement.

Article info

Received

March 08.2026

Accepted

May 05.2026

Keyword:

- ✓ School Violence
- ✓ Emotional Security
- ✓ Restorative Justice
- ✓ Symbolic Violence
- ✓ School Climate



1. Introduction:

Violence in schools represents one of the most complex sociological phenomena in contemporary educational systems. It is no longer viewed as mere "deviance" or fleeting aggressive behavior, but rather as a "structural product" reflecting sharp intersections between exclusionary educational policies and major socio-cultural transformations. The danger of this phenomenon lies in its impact on the very "essence of the social function" of the school, transforming it from a space for integration and healthy socialization into an arena for the reproduction of class and symbolic conflicts.

From the perspective of the sociology of education, school violence can be understood as a form of "protest semiotics" employed by educational actors (students) in response to what Pierre Bourdieu calls "symbolic violence" perpetrated by the institution. A school that imposes a dominant culture and marginalizes the sub-identities of learners creates a state of "anomie" or normative alienation, where the learner finds themselves in conflict between their aspirations for success and the mechanisms of "labeling" that may be employed by the administration or teachers (Bernburg & Krohn, 2003, p. 1290).

From a psycho-social perspective, recent studies confirm that the stability of the educational path depends on the school environment's ability to function as a "secure base" according to attachment theory. The erosion of this base due to a lack of psychological support and the dominance of punitive approaches inevitably leads to a decline in the inhibitions against aggressive behavior (Dunlap, 2013, p. 45).

This is where the fundamental problem arises: how can the school reconcile its role in social control with its need to be a "nurturing" environment that protects the learner's life path from deviance?

This study aims to deconstruct this debate, relying on an analytical framework that integrates the "structural reasons" proposed by Krek (2020, p. 152) with the comprehensive preventative models advocated by international research institutions. The shift from the "exclusionary punishment" paradigm to the "restorative justice" paradigm is not merely an educational luxury, but an imperative for repairing fractured social bonds and ensuring a school environment that guarantees the dignity of the educational actor and the quality of educational outcomes (Muhlhausen, 2020, p. 14).

2. Title Overview of School Violence:

Violence as a socially constructed concept, It is important to remember that the concept of 'violence', like all other concepts, is socially constructed. Williams (2005) highlights that perceptions of violence vary among individuals based on factors such as age, gender, and status. Students, teachers, school counselors, and administrators may conceptualize violence differently.

Williams (2005) found that many male students in the US do not perceive certain behaviors as sexual violence unless they involve physical acts. As another example, adults often associate violence with gang involvement, gun possession, or physical fights. Interestingly, individuals who carry guns may not view this as an act of violence but as a preventive measure. (Yavuz, 2025, p. 4)

Understanding the key causes and consequences of school violence is a challenging task. Across a wide range of disciplines and drawing from different theoretical perspectives, scholars have identified a lengthy roster of characteristics that can potentially influence, or be influenced by, violence and victimization at school. For example, at the individual level, predictors of school violence and victimization have included student demographic characteristics (age, sex, race, socioeconomic status (SES)); traditional criminological risk factors (self-control, deviant peers, antisocial attitudes, substance use) and protective factors (bonds to parents, bonds to school); personality traits (agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, openness, and neuroticism); psychological risk factors (psychopathy, empathy, moral disengagement); school activities and indicators of school success (extracurricular activities, school avoidance, academic achievement); factors related to peer relationships and social dynamics (peer rejection, popularity, and social competence); and markers of vulnerability such as LGBT identification, being overweight, or having a physical or learning disability. At the school level, focus has been placed on school climate, school disorder, school size, urbanicity, the presence of school resource officers, and the use of visible school security devices such as metal detectors and cameras. Even characteristics of the communities in which schools are embedded have been examined, such as economic deprivation, community crime, and disorder. (Scherer, 2019, p. 3)

3. Classification of types of school violence: A structural sociological:

The classification of school violence is essential for understanding its different forms within the educational environment. From a structural sociological perspective, school violence is not merely an individual behavior but a reflection of social interactions and institutional structures within the school system. Therefore, identifying and classifying its various types helps provide a clearer understanding of its causes and consequences, which can support the development of more effective strategies for prevention and intervention.

3.1 Physical Violence and the Problem of "Discipline" :

Physical violence is defined as the deliberate use of physical force with the intent to cause harm. It represents the physical manifestation of power imbalances within the school. Dunlap (2013, p.5) argues that "school violence is central to school safety issues, ranging from physical assault and group fights to the use of sharp objects." This type of violence is not merely "instinctual aggression," but rather a tool for "social status." In environments where students are academically marginalized, the body becomes the only remaining means of self-affirmation and establishing dominance within the peer group.

Verbal and Psychological Violence:

This type includes insults, ridicule, and threats. Miller (2008, p. 115) indicates that verbal and psychological abuse often precedes or accompanies other forms of violence and is the most common and has the longest-lasting impact.

This violence functions as a "symbolic exclusion mechanism."

Through derogatory nicknames or social isolation, the victim is stripped of their "positive identity" within the school, reinforcing the "paradox of inclusion" that is, the student's physical presence in the classroom coupled with their social exclusion and marginalization.

3.2 Bullying and Recurring Power

Dynamics:

According to Olweus's foundational definition (1993, p. 9), bullying is characterized by three features: intentionality, repetition, and power imbalance. It is a deliberate attack that lasts for weeks or years and aims to inflict physical or mental harm on the victim.

Thus, bullying is an "authoritarian practice" for reproducing hierarchy. The bully does not attack the "individual" for their own sake, but rather attacks "difference" (whether cultural, physical, or class-based) to reinforce the prevailing norms in the school.

Bullying behavior is a kind of attack including occasional, short-term or frequent, long-term deliberate hurts, which is repetitive and ranging from slight teasing to serious collective violence. Bullying behavior may cause physical, oral or mental attacks against victims, thus it may easily psychologically terrify and hurt victims. According to the internationally prestigious scholar, Dan Olweus' point of view after researches, bullying behavior includes hurtful and deliberate attack behaviors, and

the behaviors often last for several weeks, months even years. From Olweus' definition on bullying behavior, it can be summarized from three aspects: First, on motivation, it is deliberate, hurtful attack behavior with objective and intention; Second, on assessment of behavior result, it may hurt the victim physically or psychologically to some extent; Third, on accumulation of occurrence frequency, it is not occasional but a continuous behavior in certain period of time. (Olweus, 1993, p. 9). Olweus's definition, mentioned above, reflects three sociological dimensions that go beyond mere "bullying" to become a "mechanism for reproducing social hierarchy":

- Bullying as a "power technology" (Power Dynamics)

We see bullying as a "deliberate attack." Sociologically, the bully's aim is not only to inflict physical harm but also to "subjugate the other." Bullying is a tool for imposing a miniature "class system" within the classroom. The bully acts as a "guardian of the norm," choosing the victim based on their difference (in habitus, appearance, or achievement) to assert their symbolic superiority.

- The persistence of bullying and its relationship to the school climate (Institutional Persistence)

means that the act is continuous and prolonged (weeks, months, even years), revealing a structural failure within the institution. The continuation of bullying over extended periods signifies its

transformation into an accepted or tacitly accepted subculture within the school.

This repetition transforms violence from an isolated incident into a stable, interactive structure; the victim becomes accustomed to a submissive role, and the bully to a dominant one, amidst the silence of bystanders who fear losing their social standing.

• Semiotics of Harm: From Verbal Teasing to Psychological Violence

Harm ranges from "simple teasing" to "serious collective violence." This gradation demonstrates that bullying is, above all, "symbolic violence." "Simple teasing" is, in reality, a test of the victim's susceptibility to exclusion. When this exclusion is symbolically successful, it transforms into "psychological terrification." Here, psychological harm results from the dehumanization of the victim within the group, rendering them a "vulnerable target."

Therefore, bullying, according to the sociological perspective of Olweus, is not merely "aggressive behavior," but rather an "imbalance of power" that is institutionalized through repetition. The aforementioned "intentionality" is an attempt by the bully to regain the "agency" that he may have lost elsewhere (at home, for example), and he displaces this oppression onto a weaker victim within the school environment.

3.3 Cyber-Victimization

Violence has transcended the physical boundaries of the school and extended into the digital realm. Miller (2008, p. 116)

explains that cyber threats and online harassment place immense pressure on the learner's "personal space," making violence a "flow" that doesn't cease with the end of the school day.

This type of violence represents a "loss of agency," where students can exert hidden power beyond institutional oversight, thus undermining the "secure attachment" to the school as a protective environment.

3.4 Symbolic and Institutional Violence:

This manifests as teacher mistreatment of students or harsh punitive measures. Bernburg and Krohn (2003, p. 1295) indicate that formal intervention (such as suspension or labeling as delinquent) triggers a chain of events that diminishes future academic and employment prospects. This is the most dangerous type of violence because it is "legitimate violence" perpetrated by the institution in the name of discipline. It is a "habitus conflict" where the school punishes the student for their cultural or behavioral background instead of addressing it, pushing the learner toward "deviant life paths."

The link between these types of violence is evident in what is termed violence as a disruptive force in life. School violence is not merely a series of isolated incidents, but rather a "structural disruption." Harsh official interventions and stigmatization not only fail to stop violence, but may also "normalize" criminal behavior and increase the likelihood of future involvement in crime (Bernburg et al., 2006, p. 70).

Therefore, true safety requires a shift from "security through surveillance" to "sociological security" based on restorative justice and inclusion.

4. The concept of structural reasons for violence:

The school must therefore also take into account the fact that student behaviour can be due to certain typical cultural patterns and behaviours, certain types of authority that students are exposed to in both the domestic and school environment, certain typical forms of violence, and so on. A contemporary consequence of inclusion processes is the coexistence of two extremes:

on the one hand, the teacher in the class does, of course, have certain general expectations with regard to all students, which are derived from the goals of the curricula, standards of knowledge, the age of the students, and, in the area of moral education, from the common values of the state and the prevailing social "norms of normality"; on the other hand, there is a completely individualised approach, the need to take into account individuality and the inclusion of each student, which is a feature of special education or of inclusion as a valid principle for all students. We assume that between these two extremes there are also typical structures of behaviour that are more frequent, and typical structures of reasons for violence that are also characteristic of certain groups of those involved. Between the extremes of the general and the individualised, the school must take into account the fact that certain patterns of behaviour in the home or at school typically occur, and that these interactions produce structural reasons for violence or disruptive behaviour not only of the individual, but also of specific groups of students (Krek, 2020, p. 152).

In the context of a sociological deconstruction of the "interactive structure

that produces school violence," it becomes essential to subject this phenomenon to critical inquiry based on three pivotal conceptual pillars: "the conflict of habitus" as a clash of values, "the paradox of integration" as an institutional crisis, and "the semiotics of violence" as a symbolic language of protest.

4.1 Habitus Conflict: The gap between familial and institutional authority is evident in the fact that student behavior is not merely a momentary response, but rather an embodiment of the primary "habitus" acquired within the family environment. The school, as an authoritative structure, often disregards patterns of domestic authority that may adopt a logic of "confrontation" or "physical self-affirmation." When a student encounters a school system that imposes "norms of normality" alien to their environment, a clash of values occurs; the student's behavior, considered "normal" in their home environment, is labeled "deviant" within the school setting. This institutional stigmatization transforms violence from mere individual delinquency into a "structural reaction" reflecting a crisis of recognition of the student's original cultural identity.

4.2 The Paradox of Integration:

Between the Universality of the State and the Particularity of the Individual, one of the deepest crises of the modern school manifests itself in the "integration dilemma." The teacher finds themselves trapped between two opposing forces: universalism, imposed by the state's curricula and its standardized knowledge, and individuality, which necessitates considering the psychological and social particularities of each student. This tension generates structural pressure

within the classroom. While the school strives to standardize everyone according to a single model, it creates spaces of "invisible marginalization" for students whose abilities or backgrounds do not conform to this model. Here, disruptive behavior emerges as an alternative strategy through which the "normally marginalized" student seeks to regain agency and assert their presence within an educational system that ignores their uniqueness.

4.3 The Semiotics of Violence: From individual action to collective structure:

Beyond narrow psychological interpretations, violence must be viewed as an "interactive structure" produced by the interactions between home and school as

institutions of socialization. The violence perpetrated by specific student groups represents a "counter-culture" aimed at undermining the moral legitimacy of the institution that has structurally subjugated them. Accordingly, the structural causes of violence are rooted in the institutional failure to create a "cultural mediation" between the general expectations of the state and the socio-cultural reality of students. Thus, violence becomes a "semiotic language of protest"; when words fail to gain recognition within the system, the violent body speaks to assert its presence and establish parity with school authority.

• **Table 1: The Dialectical Relationship Between Institutional Mechanisms and Patterns of Reactive Violence**

Concept	Institutional Action	Subjective Impact on Student	Reactive Manifestation (Violence)
Normalization	Imposing the "Ideal Student" archetype and standardized behavioral codes.	Internalized inferiority and alienation among those deviating from the norm.	Symbolic Violence .Subversive defiance, cynicism, and linguistic rebellion.
Structural Oppression	Penalizing academic failure rooted in socio-economic disparities and class-based "Habitus".	Perceived systemic injustice and a profound sense of futility (Anomie).	Physical Violence .Vandalism, physical assault, and material destruction.

Dr : Ch. Hamza

Analytical Narrative : Contextualizing Institutional Mechanisms in Arab Schools

We find the dialectical relationship illustrated in Table 1 has an empirical echo within the Arab educational landscape, where the process of Normalisation is often conflated with rigid social and linguistic conformity. In many Arab school systems, the 'Ideal Student' archetype is strictly defined by the mastery of Modern Standard Arabic and the adherence to conservative behavioral codes, often at the expense of

local dialects and diverse cultural identities. Consequently, students from marginalized or 'popular' backgrounds experience a form of Internalised Inferiority, as their primary *Habitus* is devalued by the institutional hierarchy.

Furthermore, Structural Oppression in this context manifests through the 'Hidden Curriculum,' which penalizes academic struggles stemming from socio-economic disparities rather than a lack of cognitive ability. This systematic exclusion creates

a state of Anomie, where the school loses its moral legitimacy in the eyes of the student. As a result, violence emerges not merely as a disciplinary issue, but as a Subversive Strategy for identity survival. By resorting to physical aggression or the

5. Root Causes of School Violence:

A recent meta-analysis, found that delinquent peer associations, antisocial attitudes, and engaging in various forms of antisocial behavior were strong predictors of violent offending by students at school. Negative school climate and a violent school setting were also predictors of students engaging in school violence. Many of the studies to date that have examined root causes of school violence have been focused on student-on-student violence. There are far fewer studies on the causes of school violence by outsiders who enter school grounds without permission (such as occurred in Newtown, Connecticut, and Parkland, Florida) (Muhlhausen, 2020, p.14).

Analyzing the causes of school violence requires an in-depth sociological analysis that considers the indicators and dimensions of the phenomenon.

5.1 Violence as a Reproduction of Structural Anomie:

Sociologists argue that violence erupts when there is a clash between the aspirations instilled by the school system and the real opportunities available. Wilczak (2014, p.329) suggests that students who experience victimization in their social environments transfer this distress into the school setting.

Based on Merton's theory of anomie, when a student realizes that academic achievement will not guarantee upward

destruction of institutional property, the student attempts to reclaim agency within a structure that has systematically rendered their individual subjectivity invisible."

social mobility due to their class background, they reject school norms and resort to violence as an alternative means of achieving status. Thus, violence constitutes what we call a protest against marginalization in their life path.

5.2 Labeling and Identity Theory :

The school is considered an institution of "social sorting," and sometimes contributes to the creation of violence through its control mechanisms. Bernburg and Krohn (2003, p. 1288) assert that formal interventions (such as harsh punishments).

lead to the "labeling" of the student, severing their ties to traditional social networks and pushing them toward "deviant networks."

When a student is formally labeled a "troublemaker," they adopt this identity (self-fulfilling prophecy). In this case, violence becomes a means of self-defense against an institution the student perceives as "oppressive" and unjust. This is what Pierre Bourdieu calls "symbolic violence," which generates counter-violence.

5.3 Erosion of Structural Moral Authority and the School Environment:

Krek (2020, p. 152) links violence to "structural causes" related to the failure of educational strategies to create shared moral standards. A school that focuses on rote learning and neglects the "social

contract" within the classroom loses its moral authority.

Thus, the absence of "systemic attachment" makes the student feel alienated. Mubita (2021, p.12) indicates that poor school facilities and overcrowded classrooms create "ecological pressure" that lowers the threshold of patience and increases the likelihood of aggressive outbursts due to limited personal space.

5.4 Peer Subcultures and the Normalization of Delinquency:

During adolescence, peer groups become the primary source of values. Bernburg et al. (2006, p. 70) demonstrate that involvement in deviant groups leads to the "normalization" of violent behaviors, where violence becomes "social capital" that grants its perpetrator protection and respect. This is called "social learning," where violence is socially rewarded within the group. The student does not resort to violence because they are "evil," but rather because they seek belonging to a social system as an alternative to compensate for their failure within the formal school system.

The aforementioned causes do not operate in isolation; academic failure (structural) leads to school punishments (stigma), and stigma leads to the search for alternative groups (peers). These groups provide a breeding ground for violence as compensation for a lost future.

Therefore, violence is a symptom of a dysfunction in the school's social structure, not merely an individual behavioral problem.

6. The Relationship between Violence and Educational Attainment:

Bernburg and Krohn (2003) assess the life course consequences of being formally labeled as an offender, and find that not only does formal intervention lead to increased likelihood of future involvement in crime and delinquency, but official intervention can trigger a series of events which serve to reduce the likelihood that the offender will be employed in any legitimate way in adulthood. Specifically, the authors show that official intervention can reduce the likelihood that the offender will graduate from high school and increase the likelihood that they will be unemployed for significant periods of time, both of which contribute to the likelihood that they will be selling drugs in the future. Bernburg and Krohn use drug dealing as a separate dependent variable above and beyond general crime to model for criminality which may be strictly economically motivated. Because their measure of general crime includes variables indicating various degrees of theft, it is reasonable to conclude that their analyses suggest official intervention in adolescence can lead to multiple forms of illegitimate employment in adulthood via disrupting educational attainment and leading to sustained periods of unemployment. Bernburg, Krohn and Rivera (2006) also show that incarcerated individuals are exposed to a wider variety of criminal and deviant possibilities than they themselves were engaged in previously, which not only increases the likelihood that they will offend in the future, but also normalizes their behavior—both of which likely reduces their educational and socioeconomic prospects.

The relationship between violence and academic achievement is one of the most complex issues in the sociology of education. The issue is not limited to declining grades, but extends to what Bernburg and Krohn call "life course consequences." Bernburg and Krohn's study confirms that formal intervention (such as harsh school punishments or calling the police) does not address the behavior, but rather gives it "permanent legitimacy" through stigma. When a student is formally labeled as "violent" or "delinquent," a shift occurs in their social identity.

If the school, instead of being an institution of inclusion, becomes an institution of exclusion, this institutional stigma severs ties with "normative groups" (high-achieving students) and pushes the student toward "deviant peer groups" where they find acceptance and recognition. For example, we have a high school student who has been suspended several times for fights. Instead of containing him, the administration and teachers began treating him as a "potential criminal." This student will stop trying to study (because he has lost hope of being recognized by the institution) and will begin to adopt the image of a "rebellious hero" to compensate for his lack of academic achievement. This leads us to what we call the disruption of human and social capital, which triggers a chain of events that hinders high school graduation and results in unemployment. Since schools are the primary channel for accumulating cultural and professional capital, we find that harsh punitive intervention leads to "educational disruption." This disruption is not merely

a matter of absence from classes, but rather a loss of confidence in "legitimate societal values" (such as hard work and academic qualifications).

The use of a "zero tolerance" policy in some schools, where students are expelled for any infraction, leaves them without qualifications and forced to resort to the informal economy (such as drug dealing) as an alternative means of survival, as noted in the study on "illegal employment." If they are not expelled, they are exposed to punitive environments (such as prisons or rehabilitation centers), which can lead to what is known as the normalization of delinquency.

In the school environment, when violent students are isolated in special classes or sent to disciplinary centers, we create what are called "criminal laboratories." There, students learn new forms of deviance they were previously unfamiliar with, and violence becomes "normal behavior" rather than a violation of the rules. Placing a group of "troublemakers" in one school or class as a form of punishment, instead of leading to improvement, fosters a "counter-culture" that takes pride in breaking the rules, and academic success becomes, in their eyes, a sign of "weakness" or "subservience to authority."

Thus, the relationship between violence and academic achievement is cyclical. Academic failure resulting from violence leads to unemployment, and unemployment leads to a return to crime as an economic option. This is what researchers call "economically motivated criminality."

Thus, we see that Bernburg and Krohn's scientific thesis warns us that "punitive treatment may be more dangerous than the behavioral problem." Harsh official interventions within schools do not protect school safety in the long run; rather, they contribute to creating an "educationally unsuccessful citizen" and a "criminally successful citizen." To break this cycle, schools must shift from an "exclusionary, punitive logic" to a "socially supportive and restorative logic" to ensure students remain on the educational path, because a high school diploma is the first line of defense against slipping into a future life of crime.

7. School safety dimensions:

School violence cannot be approached as a one-dimensional phenomenon, but rather as the product of sharp intersections between four fundamental dimensions that together constitute the "school climate." Modern sociological understanding requires that these dimensions be deconstructed not as isolated islands, but as an interactive network that influences the "systemic connection" between the learner and their institution.

7.1 Physical dimension: In terms of physical issues of school safety, physical violence, corporal punishment and bullying are commonly discussed by scholars. For example, when looking at school safety, Dunlap (2013) focused particularly on school violence as the central aspect of school safety. In relation to the foregoing, literature often takes school violence as the contextual basis for school safety research and aims to develop response mechanisms to crises.

7.2 Psychological dimension:

Psychologically, school safety is discussed in literature with reference to how safe learners and staff feel at their school. Researches related to the feeling of being safe at school have developed into debates about how safe individuals feel, talked about relationships among school climate, school safety, and student achievement and well-being.

To deepen the academic discourse, psychological literature increasingly examines this phenomenon through the lenses of Ecological Systems Theory and Attachment Theory, wherein the school is conceptualized as a 'secure base' essential for both cognitive and emotional development."

In psychological literature, this is increasingly framed through the lens of Ecological Systems Theory and Attachment Theory, where the school is viewed as a "secure base" for cognitive and emotional development.

Building on this framework, the psychological dimension of school safety transcends physical security. In contemporary literature, this is increasingly analyzed through Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory and Bowlby's Attachment Theory. These frameworks posit that when the school functions as a 'secure base', it mitigates the internal cortisol-driven stress responses in learners, thereby optimizing the neural pathways required for complex cognitive processing and emotional regulation."

7.3 Social dimension:

Social Safety Theory hypothesizes that developing and maintaining friendly social bonds is a fundamental organizing principle of human behaviour and that

threats to social safety are a critical feature of psychological stressors that increase risk for disease. More so, Invitational Education Theory (Purkey & Novak, 1996) suggests that the school should be an inviting place across a set of five Ps which are considered as key areas. These 5 Ps are people, place, processes, policies, and programs. In relation to the foregoing two theories (Social Safety Theory and Invitational Education Theory), attention is on creating a safe school environment, including the school's building infrastructure, playgrounds and surroundings. This is in tandem with Mubita (2021) in his article on 'An assessment of the Provision, Quality and Adequacy of Welfare Facilities in Selected Schools of Lusaka' where it was noted that abundant and adequate welfare facilities are paramount to safety and health in learning environments.

Environmental dimension: The other way to look at school safety is in relation to hazards and disasters that may happen in the school environment. Natural hazards and disasters and other emergencies can happen at any time in school environments. When they happen, stakeholders should be prepared to handle them safely and effectively. Learners, teachers, parents and other school staff can work together to promote safety and minimize the effects of emergencies and other dangerous situations within their environments. Schools can be affected by natural hazards and disasters such as extreme temperatures, strong winds, fire outbreaks, floods, thunderstorms and lightning, landslides and debris flow among others. All these hazards and

disasters can make a school unsafe for teaching and learning processes. (Mubita, 2021, pp. 81–82)

The dynamic interaction between these four dimensions is what determines the "quality of school life." Physical violence is often the result of psychological tension, fueled by social exclusion, in a repulsive and unstimulating school environment. Therefore, any preventive strategy that does not simultaneously address these four dimensions will remain a reductive approach that fails to contain the phenomenon.

8. CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, an analytical reading of the results of this study reveals that school violence is not merely a transient behavioral disorder, but rather a structural phenomenon reflecting a profound crisis in the social function of the modern school. Linking Bernburg and Krohn's thesis on "stigmatization" with Krek's concept of "anomie" leads us to the conclusion that traditional disciplinary policies—specifically, "zero tolerance"—have transformed from a deterrent into a catalyst for the reproduction of deviance. When the school excludes the student and labels them a "criminal" or "troublemaker," it severs the last threads of "systemic attachment," pushing the learner to seek self-esteem within "deviant subcultures" that offer a recognition they cannot find in the formal institution.

Furthermore, the discussion highlights that violence is a "semiotic language"; the student lacking "cultural capital" finds in violence a means to reclaim "power" within a school environment where they

feel marginalized. Therefore, the shift from "physical security" (cameras and monitors) to "psychological security" (secure attachment relationships), as Muhlhausen suggested, represents an existential necessity for restoring the moral authority of the school and transforming it from a barracks of control into a nurturing environment for growth.

Recommendations:

- Replace "zero tolerance" policies with a restorative justice model.
- Train educators in attachment theory to build secure relationships with students.
- Implement early psychological monitoring systems instead of relying solely on physical supervision.

- Address anomie by linking education to real-world opportunities for social mobility.

9. Bibliography List :

- Yavuz, A. (2025). School violence and the efficacy of the action plan against violence: A school counselor perspective.
- Mubita, K. (2021). Understanding school safety and security: Conceptualization and definitions. *Journal of Lexicography and Terminology*, 5(1), 81–82. University of Zambia