Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561, P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume: 02 Issue: 05 May-2026

Student–Teacher Conflicts: Causes, Timing, And Educational Impact

Uwimbabazi Deborah

School-Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology

Published Date: May 09, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jsshrs/V2E5/2026-05**

ABSTRACT: This study aimed to explore the impact of conflict characteristics on educational outcomes, focusing on how conflict frequency, conflict nature, and conflict timing influence learning, motivation, teaching effectiveness, and relationships. The objective was to understand how conflicts in school settings shape the educational experience. The sample consisted of 120 participants, with 45.83% female and 54.17% male, and a majority of students (93.33%) compared to teachers/admin (6.67%). Descriptive analysis showed that conflicts occurred most frequently during middle and high school, a period linked to adolescence, when emotional development and sensitivity to fairness often make conflicts more intense. Regression results indicated that conflict frequency significantly reduced learning outcomes, while conflicts during secondary school and bachelor studies strongly affected student motivation. Unfair treatment emerged as a key factor influencing negative relationship outcomes. No significant predictors were found for teaching outcomes, likely influenced by the small number of teacher participants. The study highlights the importance of addressing conflict characteristics and timing in educational settings to foster a more supportive learning environment.

KEYWORDS: Conflict in education, Learning outcomes, Motivation, Conflict timing, Conflict nature, Conflict frequency, Teacher–student relationships.

1. INTRODUCTION

During my secondary school years, I witnessed a conflict between students and a teacher known for enforcing very strict rules and frequent punishments. Over time, tensions grew as students began to feel the environment was unfair and overly harsh. The conflict escalated when parents became involved, leading to tense meetings with school administrators and strained relationships between students and teachers.

Conflicts between students and teachers are a common part of school life. Sellman (2011) highlights how such conflicts can escalate when not managed well, and how peer mediation can help address tensions in schools.

Conflict is a common part of school life. It can arise between students, between students and teachers, or among school staff (Deutsch, 1973). While some conflict is natural and even healthy when managed well, unresolved or poorly handled conflict can negatively impact the learning environment (Rahim, 2002). Students experiencing frequent or severe conflict may lose motivation and engagement, while teachers dealing with conflict may find it harder to maintain effective teaching and positive relationships (Bickmore, 2002; Van Petegem et al., 2005). Recent studies confirm that teacher–student conflicts continue to significantly influence academic motivation and classroom climate (Fang, 2021; Chen et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2025).

Researchers have identified several key causes of conflict in schools. Miscommunication and misunderstanding are common triggers (Deutsch, 1973), as are perceptions of unfair treatment (Tyler & Blader, 2003). Disrespect or rudeness can also quickly damage classroom climate (Sava, 2002). Importantly, adolescence is a period where conflicts often peak, due to emotional and social changes during this developmental stage (Laursen et al., 1998). Furthermore, teacher emotional intelligence has been shown to play a key role in managing classroom conflicts effectively (Bickmore, 2024).

The effects of conflict are wide-ranging. For students, conflict can lower academic achievement and reduce motivation (Gregory & Weinstein, 2008). For teachers, it can decrease job satisfaction and teaching quality (Van Petegem et al., 2005). The timing and type of conflict may influence how serious these impacts are. Additionally, Wang et al. (2023) highlight that both teacher–student support and conflict levels directly affect student learning motivation.

This study aims to explore how conflict frequency, conflict nature, and the timing of conflict affect educational outcomes, including learning, motivation, teaching effectiveness, and relationships. Using a survey-based approach, this research will help deepen understanding of how school conflict shapes the educational experience and offer insights for improving conflict management in schools.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESIS

2.1 Introduction to Conflict in Educational Settings

Conflicts are a natural part of human interactions and are common in educational settings. They can occur between students, between students and teachers, and among teachers and staff (Deutsch, 1973). Research shows that conflict can influence students' learning and motivation, and it can also affect teachers' ability to teach and their relationships with students and colleagues (Rahim, 2002). Understanding the types and timing of conflicts, and their effects, is important for creating better learning environments.

2.2 Key Types of Conflict in Education

Different types of conflict can have different impacts. Miscommunication and misunderstanding are common causes of conflict in schools (Deutsch, 1973). When students and teachers do not communicate clearly or interpret messages differently, conflicts can arise.

Another key source of conflict is unfair treatment or perceived injustice. When students feel that they are being treated unfairly by teachers or peers, it can lead to resentment and behavioral issues (Tyler & Blader, 2003). Disrespect or rudeness is also a common cause of conflict in classrooms (Sava, 2002), which can disrupt classroom dynamics and harm relationships.

The timing of conflict may also play a role in its impact. Research suggests that adolescence is a period when conflicts are more frequent and more intense, due to the emotional and social changes students experience during this stage (Laursen et al., 1998). More recent work by Chen et al. (2024) and Peng et al. (2025) confirms that positive teacher–student relationships play a key role in reducing conflict and supporting learning motivation.

2.3 Impacts of Conflict on Educational Outcomes

Studies have shown that conflict can negatively affect educational outcomes. Conflicts in the classroom can lower students' motivation and hinder learning (Bickmore, 2002; Gregory & Weinstein, 2008). Repeated exposure to conflict may also reduce engagement and increase dropout risks (Gregory et al., 2010). For teachers, conflict with students or colleagues can reduce job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness (Van Petegem et al., 2005). A recent study by Wang et al. (2023) highlights that both teacher–student support and conflict levels directly impact student learning motivation.

The nature of the conflict matters. For example, unfair treatment has been linked to lower student engagement (Gregory & Weinstein, 2008), while miscommunication may cause misunderstandings that interfere with both teaching and learning. Teacher emotional intelligence also influences how conflicts are managed, which in turn affects classroom climate (Bickmore, 2024).

2.4 Development of Hypothesis

- Conflicts in educational settings significantly influence educational outcomes, including learning, motivation, teaching effectiveness, and relationships.
- The nature of the conflict (miscommunication, unfair treatment, disrespect) and the timing of the conflict (school level) have measurable impacts on these outcomes.
- Demographic factors, such as gender and role (student vs. teacher), may also moderate the impact of conflicts on educational outcomes.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Survey Design and Sample Composition

Primary data for this study were collected through a structured survey designed to explore the occurrence and handling of student-teacher conflicts in educational settings. Survey-based research provides valuable insights into personal experiences and perceptions, which are often difficult to capture through other means (Baker & Mukherjee, 2007). Unlike targeted studies focusing on a particular educational level or stakeholder group, this study adopted an inclusive approach. The survey was distributed across various student and educator populations without pre-screening, ensuring broad representation.

A total of 126 respondents participated in the survey which only 120 were found to be valid. Data were collected using a bilingual approach: the questionnaire was administered in English, followed by a French version for greater accessibility. This single, cross-sectional design facilitated capturing responses during a single time frame, ensuring consistency in the contextual relevance of the data, which offered insights into experiences with conflict across different educational contexts.

3.2 Survey Instrument

The survey instrument comprised 16 structured questions organized into five key sections: demographics, conflict experience, impacts, handling of conflict, and suggestions for improvement.

- **Section 1:** Demographics captured basic participant information, including age, gender, and role within the educational environment (student, teacher, administrator, or former student), using multiple-choice questions.
- **Section 2:** Conflict Experience assessed the frequency, timing, and nature of conflicts experienced with students, teachers, or administrators. Respondents indicated when the conflicts occurred (educational stage), how often they happened, and their specific characteristics through multiple-choice and "check all that apply" formats.
- **Section 3:** Impacts examined the effects of these conflicts on learning, motivation, teaching efficacy, and relationships with others in the educational community. This section used simple yes/no and multiple-choice questions to capture the subjective impact of conflict experiences.
- **Section 4:** Handling of Conflict explored how conflicts were addressed, the respondents' comfort level in speaking up about disagreements, and their perceptions of the effectiveness of conflict resolution processes within their educational institutions.
- **Section 5:** Suggestions and Comments provided respondents with the opportunity to suggest improvements for reducing conflict and to share any additional comments regarding student-teacher communication and conflict dynamics. Open-ended questions were employed in this section to allow for richer qualitative input.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

The survey's design aimed to capture nuanced psychological insights into financial decision-making, utilizing a mix of closed-ended questions that probe various aspects of investor behavior.

Table 1 presents an overview of the demographic composition of the participants and summarizes key findings related to conflict experiences, impacts, resolution approaches, and suggestions for improvement. This descriptive analysis establishes the foundation for understanding patterns in student-teacher conflict and informs potential strategies for fostering more effective communication and conflict resolution in educational contexts.

Table 1: Sample Overview and Key Findings

Total					
Count	120				
Percent (%)	100				

Age	Under 20	20~30	31~40	Above 40
Count	6	72	35	7
Percent (%)	5	60	29.17	5.83

Gender	Male	Female
Count	65	55
Percent (%)	54.17	45.83

Role in the survey	High school student	University student	No longer a student	Teacher/Lecturer/ Administrator
Count	3	76	33	8
Percent (%)	2.50	63.33	27.50	6.66

Conflict occurrence	Students		Teachers	
	Conflict	No conflict	Conflict	No conflict
Count	83	29	7	1
Percent (%)	74.11	25.89	87.50	12.50

Conflict frequency (Students)	0 times	Less than 2 times	Less than 5 times	5~10times	More than 10 times	Conflicts almost every year
Count	29	44	27	7	1	4
Percent (%)	25.89	39.29	24.11	6.25	0.89	3.57

Conflict frequency (Teachers)	0 times	Less than 2 times	Less than 5 times	5~10times	More than 10 times	Conflicts almost every year
Count	1	2	4	1	0	0
Percent (%)	12.50	25.00	50.00	12.50	0	0

Conflict timing	Elementary school	Middle and high school	Bachelor	Masters	PhD	No occurrence
Count	17	55	35	13	2	30
Percent (%)	11.11	35.95	22.88	8.5	1.31	20.26

Conflict Nature	Count	Percentage (%)
Miscommunication, misunderstanding	71	33.49
Unfair treatment, injustice	47	22.17
Disrespect or rudeness (lack of discipline)	22	10.38

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: Uwimbabazi Deborah

Coming to school late or being absent	14	6.60
Academic pressure or because of grades	13	6.13
Bad teaching style or Classroom management issues	11	5.19
Power imbalance (You felt you had no power)	9	4.25
Cultural or language issues	8	3.77
Academic dishonesty / Trickery	7	3.30
Lack of motivation/Interest	6	2.83

Impact on learning (Students)	No	Yes	A little	Not sure
Count	28	34	23	17
Percent (%)	33.93	30.36	20.54	15.18

Impact on motivation (Students)	No	Yes	A little
Count	53	31	28
Percent (%)	47.32	27.68	25.00

Impact on teaching (Teachers)	A little	No	Yes
Count	3	3	2
Percent (%)	37.50	37.50	25.00

Impact on relationship (Teachers)	Not sure	No	Yes
Count	3	2	3
Percent (%)	37.50	25.00	37.50

Comfort _ Speak up	Comfortable	Afraid	Sometimes	Not sure
Count	51	25	22	22
Percent (%)	42.5	20.83	18.33	18.33

Conflict _ Resolution	Somewhat effective	Not effective	Very effective	Not sure	No system in place
Count	33	27	25	20	15
Percent (%)	27.5	22.5	20.83	16.67	12.5

Source: Author's calculations.

3.3 Interpretation of statistical descriptives

A. Demographic characteristics and conflict experience

The demographic profile of the survey participants reflects notable trends that shape the experience of conflict in educational settings. The majority (60%) of respondents are aged 20–30, with the 30–40 age group representing 29.17%, and only 10.83% falling outside these ranges. Gender distribution is relatively balanced, with males comprising 54.17% and females 45.83% of the sample. Regarding role, students dominate the sample (93.33%), while teachers and administrators represent 6.67%, providing insight primarily from the learner perspective.

The analysis of conflict experience highlights not only how common such conflicts are, but also how strongly they are perceived to affect learning, motivation, teaching, and relationships. Overall, 74.11% of students and 87.5% of teachers/admin reported having experienced conflict, underscoring the widespread nature of interpersonal issues in educational contexts. Conflict frequency further indicates that while 39.29% of students encountered conflict less than twice, a substantial portion (25%) faced it more than two times, with 3.57% experiencing conflicts almost every year. Among teachers/admin, the majority (50%) reported encountering conflict less than five times, yet 12.5% indicated more frequent occurrences.

The impact of conflicts on students is notable, with 30.36% reporting that their learning was negatively affected, and 47.32% experiencing a reduction in motivation. For teachers/admin, 25% acknowledged that conflict impaired their ability to teach effectively, while 37.5% reported a deterioration in relationships with students or colleagues. Importantly, both groups reflected a degree of uncertainty regarding the extent of conflict impact, illustrating the complex and sometimes ambiguous effects of interpersonal tensions in educational environments.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

B. Conflict nature trends

The analysis of conflict nature shows clear patterns in the types of problems that cause tensions in educational settings. The most common type of conflict was related to miscommunication and misunderstanding (33.49%). This was followed by unfair treatment and injustice (22.17%), and disrespect or rudeness (10.38%). Other important causes included problems with attendance (6.60%) and academic pressure (6.13%). These results suggest that many conflicts happen because of problems in communication and how people are treated, rather than from official school rules or systems. The fact that unfair treatment and disrespect are among the top causes shows how important it is to create a fair and respectful school environment.

C. Impact differences between students and teachers

The results show that conflict affects students and teachers/admin in different ways. For students, conflict mostly affects their learning and motivation. About one-third of students said that conflict had a negative impact on their learning, and almost half said it reduced their motivation. For teachers and administrators, the effects were more about their work and relationships. One-fourth of them said that conflict made it harder to teach effectively, and over one-third said it harmed their relationships with students or colleagues. These differences suggest that conflict has a strong personal effect on students, while for teachers and administrators, it mainly affects their work and how they interact with others.

D. Timing of conflicts: A peak during adolescence

The analysis of when conflicts occurred shows that they happen most often during middle and high school. Almost half of the participants (45.83%) reported conflicts during this period, which is commonly linked to adolescence. This stage of life is known for emotional changes, identity development, and increasing sensitivity to fairness and respect, which may explain why conflicts are more frequent. The next most common time was during bachelor studies (29.17%), when academic and social pressures can also create tensions. A smaller number of participants reported conflicts in elementary school (14.17%), master's programs (10.83%), or PhD studies (1.67%). Notably, 25% of participants indicated they had not experienced conflicts, showing that while conflict is widespread, it is not universal. These results suggest that adolescence is a key period for conflict development in educational settings, and special attention may be needed to support students during this time.

3.4 Econometric model (Regression)

To analyze the relationship between conflict experience and its impacts in educational settings, this study employed a regression model. The model tested how conflict frequency, key conflict nature variables (miscommunication, unfair treatment, and disrespect), and conflict timing influence outcomes such as learning, motivation, teaching effectiveness, and relationships. It also examined the role of demographic factors such as gender and role (student or teacher/admin) in shaping these effects.

The use of an econometric model provides a structured way to quantify relationships between these variables and ensure that results are statistically validated. Key outputs from the model include:

- **P-value:** Indicates the statistical significance of each variable's effect.
- **ANOVA (Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients):** Measures the overall fit of the model. A significant result (P-value < 0.05) suggests the model explains a meaningful portion of the variance in the dependent variable.
- **Nagelkerke R-Square:** Shows how much of the variability in each outcome is explained by the independent variables, providing an overall measure of the model's strength.

Using this approach allowed the study to identify clear and measurable links between conflict characteristics, demographic factors, and educational outcomes. The model highlights which types of conflict and which school stages are most associated with negative impacts on learning, motivation, teaching, and relationships.

3.5. Data Organization for the Regression Model

The regression model was designed to examine the relationship between conflict characteristics and their impacts on educational outcomes. Four dependent variables were used: impact on learning, motivation, teaching effectiveness, and relationships, each measured through survey responses and converted into binary form for analysis (0 = No/A little/Not sure, 1 = Yes).

The independent variables included conflict frequency, coded as an ordinal variable, and conflict nature, represented by three dummy variables corresponding to the most common types of conflict: *miscommunication or misunderstanding*, *unfair treatment or injustice*, and *disrespect or rudeness*. Conflict timing was also included in the model as a set of dummy variables indicating whether the participant experienced conflicts during *elementary school*, *secondary school*, or *bachelor studies* (with "never experienced conflict" serving as the reference category). Additionally, demographic variables included gender and role (student or teacher/admin).

This organization allowed the model to capture both the direct effects of conflict characteristics and the moderating role of conflict timing and participant demographics, providing a structured understanding of how conflict influences educational outcomes.

All regression analyses were performed using SPSS. Binary logistic regression was used to examine the effects of conflict characteristics and demographic factors on each outcome, with a significance level set at $p < 0.05$.

The following are the results obtained from the regression model.

A. Learning Impact vs. Conflict Frequency & Timing

Table 2: Regression Analysis — Impact on Learning

Regression Statistics	
-2 Log likelihood	128.282
Nagelkerke R Square	0.216
Observations	120

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

ANOVA		
df	*Chi-square*	*Significance*
Regression	9	19.981

Predictor	*Coef.*	*Std. Error*	*Wald*	*p-value*	*Exp(B)*
Intercept	-0.024	0.97	0.001	0.98	0.976
ConflictFrequency	-0.748	0.351	4.555	0.033	0.473
Timing_Elementary	-2.295	1.108	4.29	0.038	0.101
Conflict_UnfairTreatment	0.826	0.477	2.999	0.083	2.284

Key Results:

- **R-Square = 0.216**: This means that about **21.6% of the variation** in in learning impact is explained by the model.
- **Significance predictors:** ConflictFrequency (negative), Timing_Elementary (negative), Conflict_UnfairTreatment (marginal positive).

Summary: Frequent conflict and early timing (elementary) strongly reduce learning outcomes. Unfair treatment marginally increases the negative impact.

B. Impact on Motivation vs Conflict Timing

Table 3: Regression Analysis — Impact on Motivation

Regression Statistics	
-2 Log likelihood	118.438
Nagelkerke R Square	0.266
Observations	120

ANOVA		
df	*Chi-square*	*Significance*
Regression	9	24.620

Predictor	*Coef.*	*Std. Error*	*Wald*	*p-value*	*Exp(B)*
Timing_Bachelor	2.241	0.635	12.448	0	9.406
Timing_Secondary	1.042	0.54	3.724	0.054	2.835
Timing_Elementary	-2.156	1.18	3.339	0.068	0.116

Key Results:

- **R-Square = 0.266**: About **26.6% of the variation** in motivation is explained by the model.
- **Model significance p = 0.003:** The model is statistically significant.
- **Significant predictors:** Timing_Bachelor (positive), Timing_Secondary (positive), Timing_Elementary (marginal negative).

Summary: Conflicts during bachelor's and secondary school significantly increase loss of motivation, while early conflicts may have less impact.

C. Teaching Impact vs. Conflict Characteristics

Table 4: Regression Analysis — Impact on Teaching

Regression Statistics	
-2 Log likelihood	110.304
Nagelkerke R Square	0.090
Observations	120

ANOVA		
df	*Chi-square*	*Significance*
Regression	9	6.967

Key Results:

- **R-Square = 0.090**: Low explanatory power.
- **Model not significant (p = 0.641).**

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Summary: No significant predictors were found for impact on teaching. Conflict variables did not explain variance in teaching effectiveness. It should be noted that the teacher/admin sample size was very small, which may limit the model's ability to detect significant effects on teaching outcomes.

D. Relationship Impact vs. Conflict Nature and Timing

Table 5: Regression Analysis — Impact on Relationships

Regression Statistics	
-2 Log likelihood	111.892
Nagelkerke R Square	0.191
Observations	120

ANOVA		
df	*Chi-square*	*Significance*
Regression	9	16.067

Predictor	*Coef.*	*Std. Error*	*Wald*	*p-value*	*Exp(B)*
Conflict_UnfairTreatment	-1.66	0.623	7.085	0.008	0.19
Timing_Secondary	1.202	0.54	4.953	0.026	3.327
Timing_Bachelor	1.007	0.588	2.93	0.087	2.737

Key Results:

- **R-Square = 0.191**: About **26.6% of the variation** in relationships impact is explained by the model.
- **Model marginally significant (p = 0.065).**
- **Significant predictors:** Conflict_UnfairTreatment (negative), Timing_Secondary (positive), Timing_Bachelor (marginal positive).

Summary: Unfair treatment strongly worsens relationships, and conflicts in the secondary and bachelor stages tend to harm relationships more.

3.6 Summary of results

Table 6 summarizes the key regression findings. Conflict frequency, certain conflict types, and timing significantly or marginally impacted learning, motivation, and relationships. No significant predictors were found for teaching outcomes.

Table 6: Key Results of the Regression Analyses on Educational Outcomes

Outcome	*Significant Predictors*	*Direction of Effect*	*p-value*	*Exp(B)*
Impact on Learning	ConflictFrequency	Negative	0.033	0.473
	Timing_Elementary	Negative	0.038	0.101
	(Conflict_UnfairTreatment — marginal)	Positive	0.083	2.284
Impact on Motivation	Timing_Bachelor	Positive	0	9.406
	Timing_Secondary	Positive	0.054	2.835
	(Timing_Elementary — marginal)	Negative	0.068	0.116
Impact on Teaching	— (No significant predictors found)	—	—	—
Impact on Relationship	Conflict_UnfairTreatment	Negative	0.008	0.19
	Timing_Secondary	Positive	0.026	3.327
	(Timing_Bachelor — marginal)	Positive	0.087	2.737
Predictors with $p < 0.10$ are reported as marginally significant Exp(B) indicates the direction and strength of association.				

The results show that conflict frequency, nature, and timing influence key educational outcomes. Frequent conflicts and those occurring during secondary and bachelor stages were linked to stronger negative impacts on motivation and relationships. Unfair treatment emerged as a particularly harmful factor for relationships. No significant predictors were found for teaching outcomes, likely due to the small number of teacher responses. These insights underscore the need to address both the occurrence and management of conflicts to foster more supportive learning environments.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusion

The objective of this study was to understand how conflict in educational settings affects learning, motivation, teaching effectiveness, and relationships. The sample included 120 participants, with 45.83% female and 54.17% male, and a majority of students (93.33%) compared to

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

teachers/admin (6.67%). Descriptive statistics showed that conflicts were most frequently reported during middle and high school, a period commonly associated with adolescent development.

Regression analysis revealed that conflict frequency had a significant negative impact on learning, confirming that more frequent conflict reduces students' ability to learn effectively. Conflict timing also influenced outcomes, with conflicts during secondary school and bachelor studies significantly increasing the likelihood of reduced motivation. For relationships, unfair treatment emerged as a strong predictor of relationship deterioration. However, no significant predictors were found for teaching effectiveness, suggesting that other factors may play a larger role in shaping this outcome. Additionally, the small number of teacher/admin participants may have limited the model's ability to fully capture teaching-related effects.

Despite the relatively small sample and the dominance of student responses, these findings provide useful insights into the relationship between conflict characteristics and educational outcomes. The results highlight the importance of addressing both the timing and nature of conflicts in schools to improve learning environments. Future research with larger and more balanced samples could further explore these relationships and help develop targeted interventions for effective conflict management in educational settings.

As with any study, some limitations should be acknowledged. The sample size was small and mostly consisted of students, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Future research should involve more diverse participants and explore additional variables to gain a deeper understanding of how conflicts affect educational outcomes over time.

4.2 Recommendations

At the end of the survey, participants were asked to suggest ideas for reducing conflict and improving communication in their institutions. The majority of responses emphasized the importance of open and transparent communication between students, teachers, and administrators. Many participants called for fostering active listening and ensuring that all parties feel heard and respected.

Another common theme was the need for conflict resolution training for both students and teachers. Suggestions included teaching practical skills in managing disagreements and promoting empathy. Participants also highlighted the value of building stronger relationships based on mutual respect and understanding, suggesting that a positive school climate can help prevent conflicts from escalating.

Some responses pointed to the importance of having clear policies and reporting systems that allow conflicts to be addressed fairly and transparently. A few participants stressed the need to empower student voice, ensuring that students can express concerns without fear of reprisal.

Overall, the feedback suggests that addressing conflict in schools requires a multi-level approach: promoting effective communication, building relational skills, training in conflict resolution, and creating institutional structures that support fairness and dialogue. These recommendations align well with the study's findings and offer actionable paths for improving the educational environment.

REFERENCES

1) Bickmore, K. (2002). Good training? Conflict resolution and gender in Canadian schools. McGill Journal of Education, 37(3), pp.223-245.
2) Bickmore, K. (2024). Emotional intelligence and conflict management in the classroom. Frontiers in Education, 9, pp.1–15.
3) Chen, X., Wang, Y., Li, X. and Zhang, Z. (2024). Effect of teacher–student relationship on academic engagement. Frontiers in Psychology, 15, pp.1–12.
4) Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes. Yale University Press.
5) Fang, Y. (2021). The teacher–student conflict and its educational implications. Open Journal of Social Sciences, 9, pp.348–366.
6) Gregory, A. and Weinstein, R.S. (2008). The discipline gap and African Americans: Defiance or cooperation in the high school classroom. Journal of School Psychology, 46(4), pp.455-475.
7) Gregory, A., Cornell, D. and Fan, X. (2010). The relationship of school structure and support to suspension rates for Black and White high school students. American Educational Research Journal, 48(4), pp.904-934.
8) Laursen, B., Coy, K.C. and Collins, W.A. (1998). Reconsidering changes in parent-child conflict across adolescence: A meta-analysis. Child Development, 69(3), pp.817-832.
9) Peng, J., Huang, F. and Li, R. (2025). Teacher–student relationships as a pathway to sustainable learning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 117(2), pp.327–340.
10) Rahim, M.A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. International Journal of Conflict Management, 13(3), pp.206-235.
11) Sava, F.A. (2002). Causes and effects of teacher conflict-inducing attitudes towards pupils: A path analysis model. Teaching and Teacher Education, 18(8), pp.1007-1021.
12) Sellman, E. (2011). Peer mediation services for conflict resolution in schools: What transformations in activity characterize successful implementation? British Educational Research Journal, 37(1), pp.45-60.
13) Tyler, T.R. and Blader, S.L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7(4), pp.349-361.
14) Van Petegem, K., Aelterman, A., Van Keer, H. and Rosseel, Y. (2005). The influence of student characteristics and interpersonal teacher behaviour in the classroom on student's wellbeing. Social Indicators Research, 73(1), pp.85-108.
15) Wang, Y., Zhang, L., Li, H. and Xu, J. (2023). Moderating effect of teacher–student support and conflict on learning motivation. Educational Psychology Review, 35(3), pp.467–483.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Appendix

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1	1. What is	2. What i	3. What is	4. Have y	5. In which	6. During	7. Nature	8. How wa	9. How wc	10. Do you	11. Did th	12. Did it r	13. Did the	14. Did th	15. What	16. Any other
2	30-40	Female	No longer	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Not effect	Sometime	Yes	A little	No	No	Teachers l	Love student
3	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I ignored i	Somewha	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	No	No	Talk	- Trust Each
4	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I used sch	Not effect	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Communi	None
5	30-40	Male	Teacher	Yes	Master de	5-10 times	Bad teach	I resolved	Very effe	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	A little	Not sure	M	N
6	20-30	Female	University	No	Never	0 times	Power imb	I resolved	Don??t kn	Sometime	Yes	A little	No	No	Addressin	No nothing
7	20-30	Male	Teacher	Yes	Bachelor (	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Very effe	Yes, I feel	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
8	20-30	Male	No longer	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	Unresolve	Don??t kn	I??m not s	Not sure	No	No	No	Communi	No
9	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	Parents/fa	No systen	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not sure	to incleas	the solution
10	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Elementa	Conflicts a	Miscomm	I ignored i	Don??t kn	Sometime	Not sure	No	No	Yes	promotin	None
11	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor (	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No		
12	20-30	Female	No longer	Yes	Bachelor (	Less than	Miscomm	I used sch	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	Yes	No	Yes		
13	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I ignored i	Not effect	No, I'm afi	Yes	No	No	No	more rule	They must re
14	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor (	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Very effe	Yes, I feel	Yes	A little	Yes	Yes		
15	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor (	Less than	Miscomm	Unresolve	Not effect	Sometime	Yes	No	No	No	Communi	No
16	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Disrespec	I resolved	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Make stuc	They should
17	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Very effe	Yes, I feel	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
18	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	No systen	No, I'm afi	A little	Yes	Yes	Not sure	No	No
19	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	Other stu	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	Yes	Good com	No
20	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor (	Less than	Unfair tre	I resolved	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Good com	Teachers sho
21	20-30	Male	High scho	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I ignored i	Don??t kn	I??m not s	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
22	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor (	Less than	Miscomm	Unresolve	Not effect	Sometime	No	A little	A little	No	Good communication sl	
23	Under 20	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Very effe	Yes, I feel	A little	A little	Yes	Yes		
24	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Coming to	I ignored i	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	Yes	Yes	No	Communi	No
25	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Disrespec	Unresolve	Not effect	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	A little	No		
26	20-30	Female	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Communicating effecti	
27	20-30	Female	University	No	Never	0 times	Academic	I resolved	Very effe	Sometime	A little	A little	A little	Yes		
28	Under 20	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	Other stu	Not effect	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Students'	No
29	20-30	Female	University	No	Never	0 times	Coming to	Parents/fa	Don??t kn	No, I'm afi	Not sure	Yes	No	No		
30	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I ignored i	Very effe	Yes, I feel	Yes	No	No	Yes	Education	No
31	20-30	Female	No longer	No	Never	0 times	Coming to	I ignored i	Not effect	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Good com	None
32	Under 20	Female	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I ignored i	No systen	I??m not s	A little	A little	No	No	A body that contains bo	
33	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Master de	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Don??t kn	No, I'm afi	No	No	No	Not sure	a better system	
34	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor (	5-10 times	Miscomm	I resolved	Somewha	Yes, I feel	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Clear communication	
35	30-40	Female	Teacher	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I ignored i	Not effect	Sometime	No	A little	A little	Not sure	There sho	There should
36	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	Unresolve	Not effect	I??m not s	A little	No	No	No	Teacher sl	No
37	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Doctorate	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Somewha	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	No	No	Good communication	
38	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Conflicts a	Miscomm	I ignored i	Somewha	Yes, I feel	Not sure	A little	No	No	Listening	Create an env
39	20-30	Female	No longer	Yes	Bachelor (	Less than	Coming to	I resolved	Somewha	I??m not s	No	No	No	No	Open com	No
40	Under 20	Female	No longer	No	Never	0 times	Cultural o	Parents/fa	Don??t kn	Yes, I feel	Yes	No	Yes	Not sure	Communication and mu	
41	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Elementa	5-10 times	Unfair tre	I used sch	Somewha	Sometime	Not sure	A little	A little	Not sure	Negotiati	students free
42	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Lack of m	I resolved	Very effe	Yes, I feel	Yes	Yes	A little	Not sure		
43	20-30	Male	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Very effe	Yes, I feel	Yes	Yes	No	No		
44	20-30	Female	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	Unresolve	Don??t kn	Yes, I feel	Not sure	No	No	No	There sho	I feel like pro
45	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Disrespec	I used sch	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	A little	Yes	Yes	Behavior t	No
46	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	Unresolve	Not effect	I??m not s	A little	A little	No	No		
47	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Elementa	More thar	Miscomm	I resolved	Somewha	Yes, I feel	Not sure	No	No	No	Active resolution, talkir	
48	20-30	Female	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	No systen	Yes, I feel	A little	A little	A little	No	A set of pr	No
49	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Somewha	Sometime	No	No	No	No		
50	Under 20	Female	High scho	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Somewha	I??m not s	Yes	A little	No	No	Clear com	No e
51	Under 20	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Don??t kn	No, I'm afi	No	No	A little	Yes	Better policies in terms	
52	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I used sch	Not effect	Sometime	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Teachers and administra	
53	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	I used sch	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	Yes	Great a m	No comment
54	20-30	Female	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	Other stu	Somewha	Yes, I feel	A little	A little	A little	No	Understanding	
55	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Master de	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Somewha	Sometime	No	No	No	No		

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

56	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Not effect	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	A little	Not sure	Try to spe	Try to speak
57	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I used sch	Very effe	Sometime	Yes	A little	No	No	Communi	It??s better t
58	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I ignored i	Very effe	I??m not s	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Understar	No
59	Above 40	Female	Teacher	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Unfair tre	I resolved	No systen	I??m not s	A little	No	No	Not sure		
60	30-40	Male	No longer	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Miscomm	Unresolve	No systen	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Administr	No
61	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Academic	I ignored i	Somewha	No, I'm afi	Not sure	Yes	No	Yes	Just ignor	We should tr
62	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Academic	I used sch	Somewha	Yes, I feel	A little	A little	No	No	It could be	Maybe the la
63	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Master de	Conflicts a	Disrespec	I ignored i	Not effect	I??m not s	No	No	No	No		
64	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Master de	Conflicts a	Miscomm	I ignored i	Don??t kn	I??m not s	No	No	A little	No	Nothing	Nothing
65	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I used sch	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Transpare	Most part is
66	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Not effect	Sometime	Not sure	No	A little	Not sure	look for a	communicte
67	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Elementa	5-10 time	Miscomm	I used sch	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	A little	No	Yes	Strict rule	No
68	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Disrespec	I ignored i	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	Yes	No	No	Nothing	
69	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I resolved	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Based on	None
70	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I used sch	Somewha	Yes, I feel	Yes	No	A little	No	Communi	Teacher shou
71	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Don??t kn	Yes, I feel	Yes	No	No	Yes		
72	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	Other stu	Don??t kn	Sometime	Not sure	A little	No	No	Teachers	should under
73	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I ignored i	Not effect	Yes, I feel	A little	No	No	No	Teaching	Teaching nor
74	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	5-10 time	Miscomm	I resolved	No systen	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No		
75	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Master de	5-10 time	Bad teach	I ignored i	Not effect	No, I'm afi	A little	No	A little	No	I think if t	Conflict is in
76	30-40	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I ignored i	Not effect	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	No	No	Effective	Communicati
77	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Power iml	Unresolve	Not effect	I??m not s	Not sure	A little	No	No	Talk each	To learn how
78	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	Other stu	Somewha	Yes, I feel	A little	A little	A little	No	Open com	Not really
79	20-30	Male	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Academic	I used sch	Very effe	Yes, I feel	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Rules	No comment
80	20-30	Male	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I used sch	Don??t kn	Yes, I feel	Yes	Yes	No	No		
81	30-40	Female	Lecturer/	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Disrespec	I ignored i	Don??t kn	Sometime	No	Yes	A little	Yes	Change st	No
82	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	Unresolve	Not effect	No, I'm afi	Not sure	No	No	No	More emp	Unbiased co
83	20-30	Female	University	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I used sch	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Communi	None
84	30-40	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Academic	I ignored i	Very effe	I??m not s	No	No	No	No	N/A	N/A
85	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Coming to	I resolved	Don??t kn	I??m not s	No	No	No	No	No conflic	How can the
86	20-30	Male	University	No	Never	0 times	Unfair tre	I ignored i	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Ignore.	Don??t waste ti
87	30-40	Male	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Coming to	I used sch	Don??t kn	Yes, I feel	No	A little	No	Yes	Use the sc	Sometimes on
88	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	No systen	I??m not s	A little	No	No	No	discussior	proper commu
89	Above 40	Female	School ad	Yes	Master de	Less than	Miscomm	I used sch	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	A fluent C	Teachers shoul
90	30-40	Male	High scho	Yes	Middle an	5-10 time	Unfair tre	I resolved	Somewha	Sometime	No	No	Yes	Yes	It should	I am for those
91	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Somewha	Yes, I feel	Yes	Yes	No	No	Transparent	and being ho
92	Above 40	Female	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Not effect	Sometime	Yes	Yes	A little	Yes	Effective	Good listening
93	30-40	Male	No longer	No	Never	0 times	None	Not applic	Don??t kn	I??m not s	Not sure	No	No	No		
94	30-40	Female	No longer	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Disrespec	Not applic	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	Not sure	Not sure	No
95	30-40	Female	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I ignored i	Not effect	I??m not s	Yes	Yes	No	No		
96	Above 40	Male	No longer	No	Never	0 times	None	Not applic	Don??t kn	I??m not s	Not sure	A little	No	No	Nil	Nil
97	30-40	Female	No longer	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Miscomm	I resolved	Somewha	Yes, I feel	A little	No	No	Not sure	Nothing	Open commun
98	30-40	Female	No longer	No	Never	0 times	None	Not applic	No systen	Sometime	No	No	No	No	To system	none
99	20-30	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Not effect	Yes, I feel	A little	A little	A little	No	Better rep	Non
100	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Bachelor c	5-10 time	Miscomm	Unresolve	Not effect	No, I'm afi	Not sure	A little	No	No	Open plat	Report through
101	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	Unresolve	Don??t kn	I??m not s	No	No	No	No	Honest	communication
102	20-30	Male	No longer	No	Never	0 times	Academic	I ignored i	Very effe	I??m not s	Not sure	Yes	A little	Not sure		
103	30-40	Male	University	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Somewha	Sometime	A little	A little	No	No	Reducing	strong student
104	30-40	Female	Lecturer/	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I ignored i	No systen	No, I'm afi	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		
105	Above 40	Female	No longer	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Unfair tre	I used sch	Not effect	No, I'm afi	A little	No	No	No	Associer l	Qu il y ait une
106	Above 40	Male	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I ignored i	Not effect	Sometime	A little	A little	No	No	Une bonn	Favoriser le dia
107	30-40	Female	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	No systen	No, I'm afi	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
108	20-30	Female	University	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	I used sch	Somewha	Yes, I feel	A little	No	No	No		Non
109	30-40	Male	No longer	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ponctualit	No
110	Above 40	Male	University	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I ignored i	No systen	Yes, I feel	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Il serait m	Il serait mieux
111	20-30	Male	No longer	No	Never	0 times	Miscomm	I resolved	Very effe	Yes, I feel	A little	No	No	No	Une bonn	Non
112	30-40	Male	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Not effect	No, I'm afi	A little	Yes	A little	Yes	Privil?gie	Les enseignant
113	20-30	Male	No longer	Yes	Bachelor c	Less than	Miscomm	Other stu	Somewha	Sometime	A little	Yes	Yes	Yes	Aimer les	Non
114	30-40	Male	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	No systen	No, I'm afi	A little	A little	No	No	Mettre en	Mettre en plac
115	30-40	Male	Lecturer/	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Somewha	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Mettre en	RAS
116	30-40	Female	No longer	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	Very effe	Sometime	No	No	No	No	En formar	Mettre en plac
117	30-40	Female	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Academic	Parents/fa	Very effe	Yes, I feel	No	No	No	No	Doit y avo	Non
118	20-30	Female	No longer	No	Never	0 times	None	Not applic	No systen	I??m not s	No	No	No	No	Je penses	Je n??en ai pas
119	20-30	Female	University	No	Never	0 times	None	Not applic	Don??t kn	I??m not s	No	No	No	No	Le r?el pr	Les ?l?ves ne s
120	30-40	Female	University	Yes	Elementa	Less than	Miscomm	I ignored i	No systen	No, I'm afi	Not sure	A little	Yes	No	il faut me	non
121	20-30	Male	No longer	Yes	Middle an	Less than	Unfair tre	I used sch	Somewha	No, I'm afi	Yes	No	No	No	Il faut mu	Les enseignent

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Block 0: Beginning Block

Classification Table[a,b]

Observed			Predicted		
			Impact_Motivation		Percentage Correct
			0	1	
Step 0	Impact_Motivation	0	86	0	100.0
		1	34	0	.0
	Overall Percentage				71.7

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is .500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-.928	.203	20.984	1	.000	.395

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	ConflictFrequency	.668	1	.414
		Gender	1.103	1	.294
		Conflict_Miscommunication	.002	1	.962
		Conflict_UnfairTreatment	.299	1	.585
		Conflict_Disrespect	.821	1	.365
		Timing_Elementary	4.916	1	.027
		Timing_Secondary	.332	1	.565
		Timing_Bachelor	7.351	1	.007
		Role(1)	.355	1	.551
	Overall Statistics		19.933	9	.018

Block 1: Method = Enter

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	24.620	9	.003
	Block	24.620	9	.003
	Model	24.620	9	.003

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	118.438[a]	.185	.266

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	6.631	8	.577

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

		Impact_Motivation = 0		Impact_Motivation = 1		Total
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
Step 1	1	12	11.813	0	.187	12
	2	11	10.343	0	.657	11
	3	10	10.345	2	1.655	12
	4	8	8.961	3	2.039	11
	5	8	9.335	4	2.665	12
	6	12	10.221	2	3.779	14
	7	7	9.170	7	4.830	14
	8	8	7.020	4	4.980	12
	9	8	6.150	5	6.850	13
	10	2	2.643	7	6.357	9

Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Impact_Motivation		Percentage Correct
			0	1	
Step 1	Impact_Motivation	0	78	8	90.7
		1	24	10	29.4
	Overall Percentage				73.3

a. The cut value is .500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	ConflictFrequency	-.472	.316	2.229	1	.135	.624	.336	1.159
	Gender	.753	.483	2.426	1	.119	2.122	.823	5.472
	Conflict_Miscommunication	-.325	.481	.456	1	.499	.723	.282	1.854
	Conflict_UnfairTreatment	-.574	.527	1.188	1	.276	.563	.201	1.581
	Conflict_Disrespect	-1.224	.763	2.577	1	.108	.294	.066	1.311
	Timing_Elementary	-2.156	1.180	3.339	1	.068	.116	.011	1.169
	Timing_Secondary	1.042	.540	3.724	1	.054	2.835	.984	8.168
	Timing_Bachelor	2.241	.635	12.448	1	.000	9.406	2.708	32.670
	Role(1)	-1.024	.884	1.342	1	.247	.359	.064	2.031
	Constant	-.223	.965	.053	1	.818	.800		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: ConflictFrequency, Gender, Conflict_Miscommunication, Conflict_UnfairTreatment, Conflict_Disrespect, Timing_Elementary, Timing_Secondary, Timing_Bachelor, Role.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Logistic Regression

Warnings

Text: Role Command: LOGISTIC REGRESSION This procedure cannot use string variables longer than 8 bytes. The values will be truncated.

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases[a]		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	120	100.0
	Missing Cases	0	.0
	Total	120	100.0
Unselected Cases		0	.0
Total		120	100.0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
0	0
1	1

Categorical Variables Codings

		Frequency	Parameter coding (1)
Role	Student	112	1.000
	Teacher/	8	.000

Block 0: Beginning Block

Classification Table[a,b]

			Predicted		
			Impact_Teaching		Percentage Correct
	Observed		0	1	
Step 0	Impact_Teaching	0	97	0	100.0
		1	23	0	.0
	Overall Percentage				80.8

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is .500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-1.439	.232	38.510	1	.000	.237

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	ConflictFrequency	.004	1	.952
		Gender	1.400	1	.237
		Conflict_Miscommunication	.431	1	.511
		Conflict_UnfairTreatment	.000	1	.997
		Conflict_Disrespect	1.302	1	.254
		Timing_Elementary	.030	1	.864
		Timing_Secondary	1.309	1	.253
		Timing_Bachelor	.434	1	.510
		Role(1)	.188	1	.664
	Overall Statistics		6.537	9	.685

Classification Table[a]

			Predicted		
			Impact_Teaching		Percentage Correct
	Observed		0	1	
Step 1	Impact_Teaching	0	96	1	99.0
		1	22	1	4.3
	Overall Percentage				80.8

a. The cut value is .500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	ConflictFrequency	-.114	.281	.165	1	.685	.892	.514	1.549
	Gender	.701	.510	1.886	1	.170	2.015	.741	5.477
	Conflict_Miscommunication	.078	.530	.022	1	.883	1.081	.383	3.057
	Conflict_UnfairTreatment	-.343	.544	.398	1	.528	.709	.244	2.061
	Conflict_Disrespect	-1.203	.866	1.930	1	.165	.300	.055	1.639
	Timing_Elementary	.104	.767	.018	1	.893	1.109	.246	4.992
	Timing_Secondary	.823	.530	2.412	1	.120	2.276	.806	6.429
	Timing_Bachelor	.688	.591	1.357	1	.244	1.990	.625	6.335
	Role(1)	-.712	.908	.615	1	.433	.491	.083	2.908
	Constant	-1.410	1.011	1.947	1	.163	.244		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: ConflictFrequency, Gender, Conflict_Miscommunication, Conflict_UnfairTreatment, Conflict_Disrespect, Timing_Elementary, Timing_Secondary, Timing_Bachelor, Role.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Logistic Regression

Warnings

Text: Role Command: LOGISTIC REGRESSION
This procedure cannot use string variables longer than 8 bytes. The values will be truncated.

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases[a]		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	120	100.0
	Missing Cases	0	.0
	Total	120	100.0
Unselected Cases		0	.0
Total		120	100.0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
0	0
1	1

Categorical Variables Codings

		Frequency	Parameter coding (1)
Role	Student	112	1.000
	Teacher/	8	.000

Block 0: Beginning Block

Classification Table[a,b]

			Predicted		
			Impact_Relationship		Percentage Correct
	Observed		0	1	
Step 0	Impact_Relationship	0	93	0	100.0
		1	27	0	.0
	Overall Percentage				77.5

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is .500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	-1.237	.219	32.006	1	.000	.290

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	ConflictFrequency	1.429	1	.232
		Gender	.364	1	.546
		Conflict_Miscommunication	.811	1	.368
		Conflict_UnfairTreatment	2.563	1	.109
		Conflict_Disrespect	.774	1	.379
		Timing_Elementary	.543	1	.461
		Timing_Secondary	1.326	1	.249
		Timing_Bachelor	1.045	1	.307
		Role(1)	1.106	1	.293
	Overall Statistics		14.591	9	.103

Classification Table[a]

			Predicted		
			Impact_Relationship		Percentage Correct
	Observed		0	1	
Step 1	Impact_Relationship	0	91	2	97.8
		1	24	3	11.1
	Overall Percentage				78.3

a. The cut value is .500

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B) Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	ConflictFrequency	.231	.231	1.001	1	.317	1.260	.802	1.979
	Gender	.401	.494	.660	1	.417	1.494	.567	3.934
	Conflict_Miscommunication	-.086	.528	.027	1	.870	.917	.326	2.582
	Conflict_UnfairTreatment	-1.660	.623	7.085	1	.008	.190	.056	.646
	Conflict_Disrespect	-1.468	.827	3.153	1	.076	.230	.046	1.164
	Timing_Elementary	1.000	.727	1.893	1	.169	2.717	.654	11.285
	Timing_Secondary	1.202	.540	4.953	1	.026	3.327	1.154	9.589
	Timing_Bachelor	1.007	.588	2.930	1	.087	2.737	.864	8.670
	Role(1)	-1.245	.841	2.192	1	.139	.288	.055	1.496
	Constant	-.922	.902	1.045	1	.307	.398		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: ConflictFrequency, Gender, Conflict_Miscommunication, Conflict_UnfairTreatment, Conflict_Disrespect, Timing_Elementary, Timing_Secondary, Timing_Bachelor, Role.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: Uwimbabazi Deborah