

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v14i28.1788>

Articles scientists

**Validación del instrumento Escala de solución del conflicto en
población docente de un centro temático de la Universidad de
Guadalajara**

*Validation of the Conflict Resolution Scale instrument, in the teaching
population of a thematic center of the University of Guadalajara*

*Validação do instrumento Escala de Resolução de Conflitos na população
docente de um centro temático da Universidade de Guadalajara*

Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez

Universidad de Guadalajara, México

bsilva@ucea.udg.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8851-7079>

Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán

Universidad de Guadalajara, México

ulises.delacruz@ucea.udg.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3898-1698>

Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla

Universidad de Guadalajara, México

Fabiola.gomez@cuaad.udg.mx

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4118-8983>

Resumen

En la sociedad del siglo XXI, autores como Lewis Coser, Erich Fromm, George Balandier, Randall Collins, Elton McNeil, Galtung, entre otros, han dedicado su atención al tema del conflicto, el cual ha cobrado relevancia dentro de las ciencias sociales. Con el fin de aportar evidencia empírica a este tema, se llevó a cabo la presente investigación en el personal docente de un Centro temático de la Universidad de Guadalajara, para lo cual se aplicó el cuestionario *Escala de solución del conflicto* de Rojo (2019) para realizar un análisis de tipo cuantitativo, de corte transversal. Asimismo, se llevó a cabo un análisis descriptivo con medidas de tendencia central sobre variables socioeconómicas y un análisis factorial exploratorio para los reactivos del cuestionario. Los resultados indican que el cuestionario muestra validez estadística y es representativo de la población analizada, por lo que el constructo teórico es aplicable al escenario universitario.

Palabras clave: solución del conflicto, análisis factorial, docentes, universidad.

Abstract

In the 21st century society, authors such as Lewis Coser, Erich Fromm, George Balandier, Randall Collins, Elton McNeil, Galtung, among others, have devoted their attention to the topic of conflict, which has gained relevance within the social sciences. In order to provide empirical evidence on this topic, the present research was carried out in the teaching staff of a Thematic Center of the University of Guadalajara, for which the questionnaire Rojo's Conflict Resolution Scale (2019) was applied to perform a quantitative, cross-sectional analysis. Likewise, a descriptive analysis was carried out with measures of central tendency on socioeconomic variables and an exploratory factor analysis for the questionnaire items. The results indicate that the questionnaire shows statistical validity and is representative of the population analyzed, so that the theoretical construct is applicable to the university setting.

Keywords: Conflict resolution, Factorial analysis, Teachers, University.

Resumo

Na sociedade do século XXI, autores como Lewis Coser, Erich Fromm, George Balandier, Randall Collins, Elton McNeil, Galtung, entre outros, têm dedicado a sua atenção ao tema do conflito, que tem ganho relevância no âmbito das ciências sociais. Com o objetivo de fornecer evidências empíricas sobre este tema, esta pesquisa foi realizada entre docentes de um Centro Temático da Universidade de Guadalajara, para o qual foi aplicado o questionário Escala de Resolução de Conflitos de Rojo (2019) para realizar um levantamento quantitativo e cruzado. análise seccional. Da mesma forma, foi realizada análise descritiva com medidas de tendência central nas variáveis socioeconômicas e análise fatorial exploratória para os itens do questionário. Os resultados indicam que o questionário apresenta validade estatística e é representativo da população analisada, portanto o construto teórico é aplicável ao ambiente universitário.

Palavras-chave: resolução de conflitos, análise fatorial, professores, universidade.

Reception date: August 2023

Acceptance Date: January 2024

Introduction

The topic of social conflict has been the subject of extensive study from the perspective of social sciences. However, most of these investigations have been developed in contemporary times, particularly in the field of Western sociology, hence it is the area where there has been a discussion between the theoretical postulates of conflict and consensus (Bernard, 1983), which were especially relevant in the studies of the sixties of the 20th century.

Conflict theory is based on the principle that societies are not in a state of static or total harmony, since within them there are contradictions and conflicting individual and collective interests, which leads to the appearance of confrontations. Conflict theorists recognize the historical dominance of certain social groups over others, which bases the social order on the control exercised by dominant groups, whether through the use of force or through other more subtle strategies.

This theory maintains that social change occurs chaotically as subordinate groups seek to reverse their situation and find in conflict an essential element to modify their social status. Therefore, the conflict is considered to encompass social, political and anthropological aspects, and manifests itself around values or aspirations for power and control over scarce

resources. This means that relationships within a society do not remain static, which can lead to changes or modifications in the system.

Conflict theory emphasizes the need to examine in detail the development of differences, disagreements and hostilities that arise in society, as well as the disorder generated among its members due to these conflicts. It is also crucial to identify the means used to control the conflict, through which those individuals who hold power in the economic, political and social spheres can maintain or increase their control over groups with less power (Mercado and González, 2008).

Coser *et al.* (1961) are recognized as representatives of progressive functionalist conflict theories, while Karl Marx and Frederick Engels maintain that conflict is an inherent reality of the social system and that it is possible to modify it. Likewise, contemporary theorists such as Collins, Fromm, McNeil and Balandier focus their attention on understanding and deepening conflict as a variable that drives social transformation.

During the sixties and seventies of the last century, conflict theory focused on emerging social movements, which gave rise to a specific area of study for new proposals on society and conflict. This has allowed positions to emerge that examine the conflict not only from a structural perspective, but also from microprocesses that manifest themselves in personal and group interactions, in individual feelings, in revolutionary processes and in negotiation strategies.

Theories that address consensus maintain that different social groups generally operate as complex biological entities, where there are innumerable components, each one differentiated from the other, that contribute to the permanence of said entity in a holistic manner.

When a phenomenon interferes with the expected functioning of the system or threatens to unbalance or destroy it, the component elements act to guarantee its continuity and bring it to a state of balance. From this perspective, social conflicts are considered abnormal conditions, the result of a change in the daily life of a social group, and must be corrected to prevent them from altering the integral functioning of the system.

Consensual theorists start from the premise that social groups function as a unit, since the social goal is based on a series of values and objectives common to the members of the social group. In consensus theory, the structural functionalist current is the most representative, where three types can be identified: two based on individualistic and interpersonal anthropology, and a third, properly sociological, called *social*.

Individualistic functionalism, whose main exponent is Malinowski *et al.* (1982), examines how the satisfaction of individual and organizational needs arises as pragmatic responses to these needs, while Radcliffe-Brown (1949) is representative of the current of interpersonal functionalism, which studies the mechanisms used to address situations of tension in social interaction.

With contributions from Augustus Comte, Emily Durkheim and Herbert Spencer, social functionalism establishes its conceptual theoretical foundation. Currently, the main exponents are Merton, Parsons, Davis and Moore, who focus on analyzing social macrostructures, the relationships between them and their constructive impact on various social elements.

In social functionalism, society is conceived as a comprehensive structure in which each institution is created to satisfy social needs. This implies that the system is understood with clear, pragmatic and utilitarian goals focused on aspects such as adaptation to the environment, achievement of goals to achieve integration and cohesion.

Social functions cause a series of institutions that range from the most particular (such as the family) to the most complex (such as the State). These functions establish competencies at a personal and group level, and based on this structure, functioning in unity with the social system is established, where there is a tendency towards the general adoption of positions in favor of agreements. Therefore, conflict is understood as an element contrary to the achievement of the community's objectives or as a threat to it (Lorenzo, 1995).

Munduate and Martínez (2004) point out that conflictive relationships occur in the workplace and the way they are addressed is a psychosocial stressor that impacts the level of quality of work life and the productivity of organizations. In this sense, conflicts in organizations are inevitable, which is why Turner and Pratkanis (1994) consider them a basic element in the process of production and renewal of organizational knowledge, which gives way to group thinking.

Mañas and Díaz-Fúnez (2009) suggest that discrepancies in labor aspects are the basis for creating knowledge opportunities. The dynamics of interaction between the members of an organization, whether with peer colleagues, internal superiors, or with external clients and suppliers, generates processes that can lead to conflictive relationships (Benítez *et al.*, 2008).

In this context, teamwork is essential in any organization and is considered one of the elements that most contribute to achieving high levels of productivity compared to individual performance (West, 2001). For his part, Casado (2017) explains that the conflicts that arise

in the context of teamwork are not limited only to personal issues or disagreements about specific work activities, since—after reviewing several studies—he found that both the conflict derived from Work tasks such as personal conflict have negative effects on the functioning of work groups. In other words, conflicts caused by personal issues affect the good performance of the group and, therefore, the well-being of other elements of the organization. However, if conflict arises during work activities, it is associated with better group functioning.

From the above, personal conflict is identified, also known as *affective* or *relational*, which arises from disagreements and incompatibilities between individuals who are part of a group due to personal problems that are not necessarily related to work activity (Jehn, 1995).

Jehn (1997) indicates that relational conflict is related to the presence of rumors, preferences, social situations, political positions, etc. In this sense, the existence of interpersonal problems within a group generates negative emotional responses such as anxiety, fear, irritability, suspicion and resentment. Based on this, Murnighan and Conlon (1991) state that people who perceive rejection from other group members may experience frustration, restlessness and tension.

The negative consequences associated with relational conflict include a deterioration in the quality of work life and even the desire to withdraw from the organization (Medina *et al.*, 2004). For example, in work groups, relational conflicts worsen the work environment, psychological well-being and can cause episodes of work stress (Olson-Buchanan and Boswell, 2001). According to Friedman *et al.* (2000), the effects caused by a relational conflict can last over time, and medium and long-term consequences can be expected.

Jehn and Mannix (2001) mention that if there are no changes in the level of relational conflict, longer-term effects may arise, resulting in a decrease in the quality of interpersonal interaction and the consequent loss of personal and work well-being. Several authors have related this to *burnout* syndrome, or emotional exhaustion syndrome in the organizational setting, where people experience lack of personal fulfillment and depersonalization in the workplace.

In this regard, Friedman *et al.* (2000) state that in organizations where relational conflict is present, an increase in staff work stress is observed. In fact, several studies have found that the continued presence of conflictive work relationships between members of a group can lead people in the organization to develop *burnout syndrome*.

On the other hand, the conflict derived from work activities, according to Jehn and Chatman (2000), generates discussions and reflections that become spaces to share different ideas and show different perspectives. Conflict in work activities is generally considered to be a beneficial process for achieving group efficiency and promoting members' personal well-being.

This type of conflict has positive effects on achieving both individual and group goals, as well as organizational success. In this regard, research has shown that conflict arising from work activities leads to higher quality and innovative decision making, promotes constructive debate and contributes to a more accurate evaluation, which facilitates the effective use of resources and improves quality of services provided. Furthermore, members of work groups show greater commitment in decision-making and greater identification with the group.

On the other hand, De Dreu and Weingart (2003) maintain that conflict arising from work activities has a negative impact on task execution and job satisfaction. In other words, groups that experience constant conflict when working tend to lack consensus, which makes it difficult for them to meet their goals because people focus so much on generating alternatives that they forget the need to choose and implement an action. Ross (1989) found that the usual reaction of individuals to a disagreement or questioning is to experience frustration and dissatisfaction, which negatively affects job satisfaction, increases anxiety, and generates a desire to leave the group.

Janssen *et al.* (2004), in their study on the efficiency of work teams, developed two explanatory models based on the *input-process-output model*, where conflict is considered to be a process that involves stages of a motivational and affective nature that influence the performance and results obtained by the work team. These models identify that the way in which work teams are formed is fundamental for their efficiency, since situational and organizational factors comprehensively influence the structure of the team and, therefore, affect the variables that compose it.

The current situation of conflict in the academic field highlights the importance of recognizing that the main objective of education is not only to train competent individuals in their productive tasks, but also to promote solidarity among their peers. Therefore, higher education institutions must maintain their focus on building ethical people in both their personal and professional development, since in today's society people are required to possess a variety of knowledge and skills to facilitate the understanding of social

discrepancies and establish channels that allow reflection and the search for creative agreements to address differences.

Educational institutions are the origin of various problems that arise in society, where coexistence practices are learned and recreated, as well as ways of being and acting that influence the way of thinking and perceiving the world. Therefore, it is important to recognize that conflicts play a significant role in the academic field.

The conflicts that emerge in educational institutions and require negotiation and mediation are based on different individual interests within a given situation. Conflicts of interest arise when the actions of a person seeking to maximize his or her benefit interfere with, block, or prevent another person from satisfying his or her desires and benefits (Deutsch, 1973).

Currently, the study of teachers, their behaviors, qualities, personality, functions and other attributes are topics of interest and continued relevance, since researchers in the educational field focus on pedagogical interest to explore the various perspectives of the exercise. teacher in the classroom.

In this scenario, communication between teachers and students is essential when a problem arises or it is necessary to exchange information about conceptions of reality, as well as when seeking to share personal experiences. In this sense, students can perceive non-verbal communication and respond spontaneously. In fact, sometimes they can respond with aggression, cynicism, ridicule, etc., when the teacher tries to engage in some type of interaction. Often, the teacher does not even understand the reason for this aggressiveness, but responds immediately to it.

Due to all of the above, the teacher's authority and leadership role are perceived as increasingly deteriorated, since any personal judgment could be considered aggression. On many occasions, the teacher faces difficulties in addressing the students without being interpreted as an attack, which weakens their authority, which serves as support to formulate the following question: to what extent do teachers perceive the conflicts present in education? university in the current scenario?

Methodology

This research was developed using a quantitative approach, with a cross-sectional study design and a descriptive and correlational scope (Hernández Sampieri *et al.*, 2010). To do this, the variable under study was not manipulated, since its description and characterization was simply carried out.

The population under study was made up of the teaching staff of the University Center of Art, Architecture and Design (CUAAD) of the University of Guadalajara. Questionnaires were administered to managers and teachers of the entire academic offering of said center, after obtaining consent (see Annex 1). This study is framed within a cross-sectional design, since it is an observational research that analyzes data on variables collected in a specific period on a predefined population and sample.

To collect data, the “Conflict Resolution Scale” instrument (Annex 2) was used, adapted from two questionnaires previously used by Rojo (2019). The survey applied consisted of a closed-ended questionnaire structured with a Likert-type scale, which included a total of 50 items or reagents. Each item presented five response options, where the value one represented “it is rarely or never my case”, the value two corresponded to “it is rarely my case”, the value three corresponded to “sometimes it is my case”, the value four to “many times this is my case”, and the value five to “very often this is my case”.

The questionnaire used to collect data related to the study of conflicts in the classroom, their causes and coping styles is divided into three sections: perception of conflict, causes of conflict and conflict resolution scale. In addition, the first section included questions aimed at collecting data on personal and professional variables.

Data collection was carried out in person using printed questionnaires, for which support was requested from the department heads to contact the teaching staff assigned to their respective departments and apply the questionnaire to them. The offices of the different managers and the signature booth of the university center were also physically located for this purpose.

The data collection period was carried out during the month of April 2022, that is, before the end of the semester, in order not to interfere with the teaching staff's schedules. The information was collected in person and then proceeded to the construction of a database. This database was analyzed statistically to interpret the results and perform the corresponding analysis.

The sample size was determined using the statistical formula with a 95% confidence level and an 8% margin of error, resulting in a target sample of 119 observations. Once this sample size was established, the data was collected and a total of 119 questionnaires were applied.

However, when building the database, it was detected that two questionnaires did not meet the necessary criteria to be considered valid, since they had not been completed correctly. Therefore, it was decided not to include them in the analysis, resulting in a final database consisting of 117 valid questionnaires.

Analysis

First, a descriptive analysis was carried out using the SPSS 26 statistical program to examine the socioeconomic variables and understand the composition of the sample. It was observed that 48.7% of the questionnaires were answered by women, while 51.3% corresponded to men. Regarding the age of the teachers surveyed, a greater frequency was found in the age range between 36 and 45 years (30.8%), followed by the range between 46 and 55 years (28.2%).

Regarding marital status, a higher frequency was recorded in married marital status (57.3%). Regarding the workload, most teachers have a workload of between 10 to 20 hours per week, followed by the range of 31 to 40 hours. Regarding education, almost 50% of the teaching staff have a master's degree.

In the analysis of arithmetic means, it was found that the perception of conflict in the analyzed population has a mean of 2.82, while in the causes of conflict scale the mean was 2.68 and in the conflict solution scale the mean was 2.88. 73.34% of the sample mentioned perceiving conflict situations in the performance of their work duties, which was perceived with a higher percentage by women (52.22%).

Once the descriptive analysis was completed, a statistical analysis was performed. For this, 108 questionnaires were taken from the initial sample of 117, although 9 were excluded according to the test (table 1).

Table 1. Case processing summary

| | | N | % |
|--|----------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 108 | 92.3 |
| | Excluded to | 9 | 7.7 |
| | Total | 117 | 100.0 |
| to. Listwise elimination is based on all variables in the procedure. | | | |

Source: self made

Next, a statistical reliability analysis of the entire “Conflict Perception” questionnaire was carried out to verify the feasibility of conducting an exploratory factor analysis. For this, Cronbach's alpha test was used, which showed good statistical reliability with a value of 0.826 (that is, close to one) (table 2).

Table 2. Statistical reliability analysis

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items | # of elements |
|------------------|--|---------------|
| .826 | .823 | fifty |

Source: self made

Then, the statistical reliability test was carried out on the first part of the questionnaire corresponding to the perception of conflict, where it was found that this part does not have a valid statistical reliability, since when carrying out the reliability test the value of Cronbach's alpha It turned out to be only 0.519 (table 3).

Table 3. Reliability analysis of the conflict perception dimension

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items | # of elements |
|------------------|--|---------------|
| .519 | .516 | 6 |

Source: self made

Afterwards, the statistical reliability test was carried out on the “Causes of the conflict” dimension, and good statistical reliability was found. The data obtained showed a value of 0.840 in Cronbach's alpha (table 4).

Table 4. Reliability analysis of the causes of conflict dimension

| Cronbach's alpha | Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items | # of elements |
|------------------|--|---------------|
| .840 | .839 | 9 |

Source: self made

The next step was to carry out a reliability analysis for the “Conflict Resolution Scale” dimension. A value of 0.741 was found, which is sufficient to demonstrate internal statistical reliability (table 5).

Table 5. Reliability analysis of the conflict resolution scale dimension

| Cronbach's alpha | Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items | # of elements |
|------------------|--|---------------|
| .741 | .736 | 35 |

Source: self made

Once the statistical reliability tests were completed for both the questionnaire as a whole and for each of its component parts, an exploratory factor analysis was carried out. Because the first part, “Perception of conflict”, did not show optimal statistical reliability, it was discarded for carrying out the factor analysis.

Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy test was applied , which yielded a value of 0.802, which indicates an appropriate measure to perform the exploratory factor analysis. Furthermore, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant at levels greater than 99% for both sections (Table 6).

Table 6. KMO test and Bartlett's sphericity of the causes of conflict scale

| | | |
|--|---------------------|---------|
| Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin measure of sampling adequacy | | .802 |
| Bartlett's test of sphericity | Approx. Chi squared | 356,198 |
| | G1 | 36 |
| | Next. | ,000 |

Source: self made

Then, the exploratory factor analysis was developed for the “Causes of conflict” scale. The results showed that the values for the total explained variance indicate that the first component accumulates 44.26% of the total 100% of the "Causes of the conflict" dimension, while a second component accumulates 13.12%, which added to the first component gives a total value of 57.38% (table 7).

Table 7. Total explained variance of the causes of conflict scale

| Component | Initial eigenvalues | | | Sums of charges squared of the extraction | | |
|--|---------------------|------------|---------------|---|------------|---------------|
| | Total | % variance | % accumulated | Total | % variance | % accumulated |
| 1 | 3,984 | 44,264 | 44,264 | 3,984 | 44,264 | 44,264 |
| 2 | 1,181 | 13,126 | 57,389 | 1,181 | 13,126 | 57,389 |
| 3 | .930 | 10,330 | 67,719 | | | |
| 4 | .785 | 8,720 | 76,439 | | | |
| 5 | .602 | 6,693 | 83,133 | | | |
| 6 | .526 | 5,841 | 88,974 | | | |
| 7 | .385 | 4,279 | 93,252 | | | |
| 8 | .332 | 3,684 | 96,937 | | | |
| 9 | .276 | 3,063 | 100,000 | | | |
| Extraction method: principal component analysis. | | | | | | |

Source: self made

Once the exploratory factor analysis was completed, two components were identified. The first is composed of items CC7, CC8, CC9, CC10, CC11, CC12, CC13 and CC14, while the second only consists of item CC15 (table 8).

Table 8. Matrix of scale components causes of conflict

| | Component | |
|--|-----------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 |
| CC7 | .648 | -.323 |
| CC8 | .628 | -.582 |
| CC9 | .782 | .013 |
| CC10 | .689 | -.032 |
| CC11 | .656 | .317 |
| CC12 | .642 | .467 |
| CC13 | .679 | -.267 |
| CC14 | .742 | -.030 |
| CC15 | .480 | .588 |
| Extraction method: principal component analysis. | | |

Source: self made

Once the sampling adequacy analysis (KMO) for the “Causes of conflict” scale was completed, the exploratory factor analysis was carried out. The KMO returned a value of 0.725, which indicates an appropriate measure to perform the factor analysis. Furthermore, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant at levels greater than 99% for both sections (Table 9).

Table 9. KMO test and Bartlett's sphericity of the conflict resolution scale

| | | |
|--|---------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin measure of sampling adequacy | | .725 |
| Bartlett's test of sphericity | Approx. Chi squared | 1906.323 |
| | gl | 595 |
| | Next. | ,000 |

Source: self made

In carrying out the exploratory factor analysis for the “Conflict Resolution” scale, the following values were obtained for the total variance explained: the first component accumulates 22.98% of the 100% of the scale dimension, while the second accumulates the 11.27%. In addition, other components were found with the following variances: 5.89%, 5.42%, 4.83%, 4.47%, 3.99%, 3.68%, and 3.10%. Together, these add up to 65.67% (table 10).

Table 10. Total explained variance of the conflict resolution scale

| Component | Initial eigenvalues | | | Sums of charges squared of the extraction | | | Sums of charges squared of rotation | | |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|---------------|---|------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| | Total | % variance | % accumulated | Total | % variance | % accumulated | Total | % variance | % accumulated |
| 1 | 8,045 | 22,985 | 22,985 | 8,045 | 22,985 | 22,985 | 3,358 | 9,595 | 9,595 |
| 2 | 3,948 | 11,279 | 34,265 | 3,948 | 11,279 | 34,265 | 3,308 | 9,453 | 19,048 |
| 3 | 2,062 | 5,892 | 40,156 | 2,062 | 5,892 | 40,156 | 3,058 | 8,738 | 27,786 |
| 4 | 1,899 | 5,424 | 45,581 | 1,899 | 5,424 | 45,581 | 2,511 | 7,174 | 34,959 |
| 5 | 1,691 | 4,831 | 50,411 | 1,691 | 4,831 | 50,411 | 2,494 | 7,126 | 42,086 |
| 6 | 1,565 | 4,470 | 54,882 | 1,565 | 4,470 | 54,882 | 2,273 | 6,495 | 48,581 |
| 7 | 1,397 | 3,992 | 58,874 | 1,397 | 3,992 | 58,874 | 2,199 | 6,282 | 54,863 |
| 8 | 1,290 | 3,687 | 62,561 | 1,290 | 3,687 | 62,561 | 2,159 | 6,169 | 61,032 |
| 9 | 1,088 | 3,109 | 65,670 | 1,088 | 3,109 | 65,670 | 1,623 | 4,637 | 65,670 |
| 10 | .999 | 2,854 | 68,524 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------|------|-------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| eleven | .970 | 2,772 | 71,296 | | | | | |
| 12 | .941 | 2,689 | 73,985 | | | | | |
| 13 | .918 | 2,623 | 76,607 | | | | | |
| 14 | .713 | 2,036 | 78,644 | | | | | |
| fifteen | .685 | 1958 | 80,601 | | | | | |
| 16 | .655 | 1,871 | 82,472 | | | | | |
| 17 | .609 | 1,741 | 84,213 | | | | | |
| 18 | .596 | 1,702 | 85,915 | | | | | |
| 19 | .567 | 1,620 | 87,535 | | | | | |
| twenty | .522 | 1,492 | 89,027 | | | | | |
| twenty-one | .491 | 1,403 | 90,430 | | | | | |
| 22 | .434 | 1,239 | 91,669 | | | | | |
| 23 | .408 | 1,165 | 92,834 | | | | | |
| 24 | .334 | .955 | 93,789 | | | | | |
| 25 | .311 | .889 | 94,679 | | | | | |
| 26 | .278 | .794 | 95,472 | | | | | |
| 27 | .268 | .766 | 96,238 | | | | | |
| 28 | .243 | .695 | 96,933 | | | | | |
| 29 | .214 | .612 | 97,545 | | | | | |
| 30 | .185 | .528 | 98,073 | | | | | |
| 31 | .169 | .484 | 98,557 | | | | | |
| 32 | .165 | .470 | 99,027 | | | | | |
| 33 | .131 | .374 | 99,401 | | | | | |
| 3. 4 | .114 | .326 | 99,727 | | | | | |
| 35 | .095 | .273 | 100,000 | | | | | |

Extraction method: principal component analysis.

Source: self made

Once the exploratory factor analysis was carried out, nine components were extracted. The first composed of items SC16, C24, SC27, SC28, SC30, SC31, SC35, SC36, SC39, SC42, SC44, SC45, SC46 and SC50. The second for items SC17, SC18, SC19, SC21, SC22, SC26, SC33, SC37, SC38, SC41, SC47 and SC48. The third for items SC20, SC32 and SC40.

The fourth by SC34, the fifth by SC23, SC25 and SC43, the sixth by SC49, and the ninth by SC29 (table 11).

Table 11. Matrix of components of the conflict resolution scale

| | Component | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----------|-------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| SC16 | 0.396 | 0.355 | 0.17 | - 0.287 | 0.259 | - 0.366 | - 0.185 | - 0.166 | 0.226 |
| SC24 | 0.52 | 0.218 | - 0.139 | -0.35 | 0.068 | - 0.113 | - 0.085 | - 0.207 | 0.354 |
| SC27 | 0.526 | 0.369 | 0.285 | - 0.314 | 0.13 | - 0.058 | 0.103 | 0.29 | -0.03 |
| SC28 | 0.45 | 0.335 | - 0.216 | - 0.313 | - 0.111 | - 0.307 | 0.084 | 0.192 | - 0.049 |
| SC30 | 0.428 | 0.396 | - 0.009 | 0.265 | 0.158 | - 0.008 | 0.115 | 0.008 | - 0.372 |
| SC31 | 0.52 | 0.359 | - 0.199 | 0.033 | 0.179 | 0.428 | 0.031 | 0.02 | - 0.228 |
| SC35 | 0.517 | 0.24 | - 0.282 | 0.396 | -0.17 | - 0.197 | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.068 |
| SC36 | 0.534 | 0 | 0.398 | - 0.001 | - 0.026 | 0.147 | 0.334 | 0.136 | 0.217 |
| SC39 | 0.464 | 0.159 | 0.147 | 0.379 | - 0.175 | 0.141 | 0.405 | 0.088 | 0.077 |
| SC42 | 0.493 | 0.233 | - 0.081 | - 0.344 | -0.32 | 0.028 | - 0.083 | 0.269 | - 0.105 |
| SC44 | 0.548 | 0.324 | - 0.189 | - 0.014 | - 0.142 | 0.208 | - 0.516 | 0.136 | 0.029 |
| SC45 | 0.55 | 0.381 | -0.31 | 0.069 | 0.144 | 0.124 | 0.112 | - 0.334 | - 0.146 |
| SC46 | 0.582 | 0.258 | - 0.078 | 0.169 | 0.218 | 0.145 | - 0.273 | -0.26 | - 0.042 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| SC50 | 0.545 | 0.161 | - 0.197 | 0.145 | - 0.251 | 0.164 | - 0.099 | 0.094 | 0.088 |
| SC17 | 0.407 | 0.426 | 0.21 | 0.01 | - 0.068 | - 0.139 | 0.138 | - 0.444 | 0.244 |
| SC18 | -0.44 | 0.494 | 0.324 | - 0.116 | - 0.256 | 0.047 | - 0.058 | - 0.331 | - 0.035 |
| SC19 | - 0.511 | 0.402 | 0.273 | - 0.011 | 0.167 | 0.027 | - 0.235 | - 0.021 | - 0.135 |
| SC21 | 0.398 | 0.46 | 0.182 | 0.343 | -0.03 | - 0.219 | - 0.058 | - 0.059 | - 0.065 |
| SC22 | - 0.437 | 0.393 | 0.298 | 0.223 | - 0.034 | -0.1 | - 0.081 | - 0.103 | - 0.017 |
| SC26 | - 0.548 | 0.273 | 0.002 | - 0.485 | 0.267 | - 0.022 | 0.04 | 0.199 | 0.085 |
| SC33 | - 0.461 | 0.421 | - 0.198 | - 0.135 | - 0.217 | - 0.264 | - 0.018 | 0.146 | - 0.291 |
| SC37 | - 0.582 | 0.338 | - 0.102 | 0.008 | 0.084 | 0.122 | 0.196 | - 0.083 | 0.09 |
| SC38 | - 0.507 | 0.39 | -0.35 | 0.195 | 0.049 | -0.13 | 0.268 | 0.124 | - 0.022 |
| SC41 | - 0.512 | 0.477 | 0.189 | 0.02 | - 0.134 | -0.02 | 0.229 | - 0.004 | - 0.071 |
| SC47 | -0.3 | 0.352 | 0.222 | - 0.047 | - 0.412 | 0.013 | 0.097 | 0.248 | 0.188 |
| SC48 | - 0.087 | 0.566 | - 0.109 | - 0.277 | - 0.286 | 0.339 | - 0.089 | - 0.068 | - 0.015 |
| SC20 | 0.339 | 0.255 | 0.406 | 0.299 | 0.141 | 0.027 | - 0.227 | 0.38 | - 0.007 |
| SC32 | - 0.436 | 0.001 | 0.393 | 0.1 | - 0.286 | - 0.232 | - 0.084 | - 0.211 | - 0.261 |
| SC40 | 0.516 | - 0.065 | 0.535 | - 0.027 | 0.193 | 0.281 | 0.151 | 0.128 | 0.1 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| SC34 | - 0.325 | 0.317 | - 0.044 | 0.389 | - 0.012 | - 0.149 | - 0.425 | 0.274 | 0.256 |
| SC23 | 0.339 | 0.364 | - 0.122 | - 0.119 | 0.369 | - 0.377 | 0.27 | 0.056 | - 0.066 |
| SC25 | - 0.618 | 0.316 | 0.054 | 0.101 | 0.456 | 0.276 | - 0.117 | - 0.013 | 0.142 |
| SC43 | - 0.567 | 0.198 | -0.05 | 0.04 | 0.46 | 0.064 | 0.071 | 0.175 | - 0.113 |
| SC49 | - 0.484 | 0.368 | - 0.137 | -0.15 | - 0.163 | 0.514 | 0.162 | - 0.057 | 0.096 |
| SC29 | - 0.518 | 0.199 | - 0.377 | 0.313 | 0.011 | - 0.096 | 0.081 | 0.057 | 0.45 |
| Extraction method: principal component analysis. | | | | | | | | | |

Source: self made

As can be seen in the factor analysis carried out for each of the parts of the “Conflict Resolution Scale” questionnaire, a reduction in the number of components is observed after the exploratory factor analysis. For the “Causes of the conflict” part, which consists of nine items, it was reduced to two components, while for the “Conflict resolution” part, which consists of 35 items, nine components were obtained.

Factor analysis for the conflict resolution scale instrument

To evaluate the relevance of conducting an exploratory factor analysis to the “Conflict Resolution Scale” instrument as a whole, the sampling adequacy test (KMO) was carried out, which yielded a value of 0.673. This result indicates that it is appropriate to perform the exploratory factor analysis. Furthermore, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant at levels greater than 99% for both sections, which also supports the suitability of the exploratory factor analysis (Table 12).

Table 12. KMO test and Bartlett's sphericity of the conflict resolution scale instrument

| | | |
|--|---------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin measure of sampling adequacy | | .673 |
| Bartlett's test of sphericity | Approx. Chi squared | 2776,923 |
| | GI | 946 |
| | Next. | ,000 |

Source: self made

Once the feasibility of carrying out the exploratory factor analysis has been confirmed, it is observed that the values for the total explained variance of the conflict resolution scale show that the first component accumulates 19.85% of the 100% of the instrument. For its part, the second component accumulates 11.92%, while the third represents 6.09% of the total variance. Then, the fourth comprises 5.49%, the fifth 4.98%, the sixth 4.21%, the seventh 3.85%, the eighth 3.41%, the ninth 3.07%, the tenth 2.85%, the eleventh 2.79% . , the twelfth 2.53%, and the thirteenth 2.27%. Added together, these values represent 73.34% of the total variance of the instrument (table 13).

Table 13. Total explained variance of the conflict resolution scale instrument

| Component | Initial eigenvalues | | | Sums of charges squared of the extraction | | |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|---------------|---|------------|---------------|
| | Total | % variance | % accumulated | Total | % variance | % accumulated |
| 1 | 8,736 | 19,855 | 19,855 | 8,736 | 19,855 | 19,855 |
| 2 | 5,247 | 11,925 | 31,779 | 5,247 | 11,925 | 31,779 |
| 3 | 2,680 | 6,091 | 37,871 | 2,680 | 6,091 | 37,871 |
| 4 | 2,415 | 5,490 | 43,360 | 2,415 | 5,490 | 43,360 |
| 5 | 2,192 | 4,981 | 48,341 | 2,192 | 4,981 | 48,341 |
| 6 | 1,852 | 4,210 | 52,551 | 1,852 | 4,210 | 52,551 |
| 7 | 1,695 | 3,852 | 56,404 | 1,695 | 3,852 | 56,404 |
| 8 | 1,501 | 3,412 | 59,816 | 1,501 | 3,412 | 59,816 |
| 9 | 1,351 | 3,070 | 62,886 | 1,351 | 3,070 | 62,886 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| 10 | 1,256 | 2,854 | 65,739 | 1,256 | 2,854 | 65,739 |
| eleven | 1,228 | 2,790 | 68,529 | 1,228 | 2,790 | 68,529 |
| 12 | 1,116 | 2,537 | 71,067 | 1,116 | 2,537 | 71,067 |
| 13 | 1,002 | 2,277 | 73,344 | 1,002 | 2,277 | 73,344 |
| 14 | .976 | 2,218 | 75,562 | | | |
| fifteen | .890 | 2,024 | 77,586 | | | |
| 16 | .793 | 1,802 | 79,388 | | | |
| 17 | .773 | 1,757 | 81,145 | | | |
| 18 | .689 | 1,565 | 82,711 | | | |
| 19 | .619 | 1,406 | 84,117 | | | |
| twenty | .603 | 1,370 | 85,487 | | | |
| twenty-one | .572 | 1,300 | 86,787 | | | |
| 22 | .552 | 1,255 | 88,042 | | | |
| 23 | .524 | 1,191 | 89,233 | | | |
| 24 | .485 | 1,102 | 90,334 | | | |
| 25 | .435 | .989 | 91,324 | | | |
| 26 | .391 | .889 | 92,212 | | | |
| 27 | .380 | .864 | 93,076 | | | |
| 28 | .334 | .758 | 93,834 | | | |
| 29 | .302 | .687 | 94,522 | | | |
| 30 | .291 | .661 | 95,183 | | | |
| 31 | .266 | .605 | 95,787 | | | |
| 32 | .256 | .581 | 96,369 | | | |
| 33 | .219 | .498 | 96,867 | | | |
| 3. 4 | .208 | .472 | 97,339 | | | |
| 35 | .184 | .418 | 97,757 | | | |
| 36 | .157 | .357 | 98,114 | | | |
| 37 | .150 | .342 | 98,456 | | | |
| 38 | .133 | .303 | 98,759 | | | |
| 39 | .128 | .291 | 99,050 | | | |
| 40 | .113 | .256 | 99,307 | | | |
| 41 | .088 | .201 | 99,508 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|---------|--|--|--|
| 42 | .082 | .186 | 99,694 | | | |
| 43 | .072 | .164 | 99,858 | | | |
| 44 | .062 | .142 | 100,000 | | | |
| Extraction method: principal component analysis. | | | | | | |

Source: self made

Once the exploratory factor analysis has been completed and observing the loadings of the total explained variance of each of the components, the thirteen components are extracted. According to the factor loadings, it is observed that components one and two concentrate 37.77% of the total explained variance (table 14).

Table 14. Matrix of components of the conflict resolution scale instrument

| Component | Items that make up it and load |
|-----------|---|
| 1 | (SC18 = 0.505) (SC19 = 0.577) (SC22 = 0.492) (SC26 = 0.594) (SC28 = 0.412) (SC29 = 0.552) (SC31 = 0.469) (SC32 = 0.429) (SC33 = 0.505) (SC35 = 0.483) (SC36 = 0.535) (SC37 = 0.606) (SC38 = 0.531) (SC39 = 0.416) (SC41 = 0.563) (SC43 = 0.589) (SC44 = 0.468) (SC45 = 0.498) (SC46 = 0.532) (SC50 = 0.521) |
| 2 | (CC7 = 0.474) (CC8 = 0.412) (CC9 = 0.583) (CC10 = 0.479) (CC11 = 0.467) (CC14 = 0.471) (SC16 = 0.408) (SC17 = 0.506) (SC21 = 0.514) (SC23 = 0.432) (SC27 = 0.466) (SC30 = 0.435) |
| 3 | (CC13 = 0.517) (SC40 = 0.517) (SC48 = 0.481) |
| 4 | (CC12 = 0.599) (CC15 = 0.509) |
| 5 | |
| 6 | (SC49 = 0.532) |
| 7 | (SC25 = 0.412) (SC42 = 0.413) |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| 8 | (SC34 = 0.406) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | (SC24 = 0.383) |
| eleven | (SC20 = 0.571) |
| 12 | (SC47 = 0.425) |
| 13 | |
| Extraction method: principal component analysis. | |

Source: self made

In the exploratory factor analysis for the conflict resolution scale instrument, thirteen components are extracted. The first is made up of items SC18, SC19, SC22, SC26, SC28, SC29, SC31, SC32, SC33, SC35, SC36, SC37, SC38, SC39, SC41, SC43, SC44, SC45, SC 46 and SC 50. The second for items CC7, CC8, CC9, CC10, CC11, CC14, SC16, SC17, SC21, SC23, SC27 and SC30. The third for items CC13, SC40 and SC48. The fourth for items CC12 and CC15. The sixth by SC49. The seventh for SC25 and SC42. The eighth by SC34. The tenth by SC24. The eleventh for SC20 and the twelfth for SC47.

Discussion

Based on the present investigation, it was found that the conflict resolution scale instrument shows statistical validity. In this case, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.826 was obtained, while Rojo (2019) reported a Cronbach's alpha of 0.74. Regarding the perception of conflict scale, in the present investigation an average of 2.82 was obtained, while Rojo reported 2.58.

In relation to the difference between the sex variable in the perception of conflict, women tend to perceive it more than men, which agrees with the findings of González (2017). On the other hand, Pérez *et al.* (2015) report a statistical reliability of 0.92 in Cronbach's alpha coefficient, with significant factor loadings for the dimensions of conflict perception. Furthermore, 75% of the sample perceives conflict situations, which is also consistent with the results obtained in this research.

Pérez *et al.* They conclude that in educational institutions it is necessary to review academic policies and programs so that teachers have fewer elements that raise discrepancies that lead to conflict situations.

In the perception of conflict, teachers tend to resort to requesting help from others to generate a mediation process, either with peers in the workplace or, if a satisfactory solution is not found, resort to higher order instances to address the problem. such situations.

Likewise, sometimes, the lack of communication on the part of the management authorities turns into unequal communication, which produces misunderstandings among teachers and, with it, power struggles based on assumptions without a real foundation, such as rumors, expectations regarding certain recognitions or sanctions, and the reactivation of latent conflicts of different kinds, which affects the quality and efficiency of the institution.

Conclusions

The present research provides empirical evidence to theoretically support the conflict resolution scale instrument for the teaching population of the CUAAD of the University of Guadalajara, which contributes to generating knowledge about a reality present in society and the need to develop appropriate strategies to address it. .

In this sense, conflict resolution is a field of study that proposes innovative and applicable approaches to specific problems. For example, from the academic field, the objective is to identify the differences and reduce the opposing positions that arise in teaching at the institutional level. This is achieved through understanding reality and implementing constructive strategies that channel conflictive situations into neutral scenarios, taking into account the needs and characteristics of the parties involved.

However, given that alternative conflict resolution methods focus on specific acts of confrontation, resolution alternatives tend to be reactive. This can make it difficult to evaluate the future consequences of the strategies used by those involved, which generates risks in their implementation. Therefore, it is crucial to carry out studies that identify the presence of conflicts to avoid scenarios of uncontrollable chaos or additional difficulties in their resolution.

In short, the objective of research in the area of conflict resolution is to explore the situations that arise in non-peaceful relationships and understand the underlying causes, which implies investigating very specific aspects of their origin. Then, the focus should be directed towards a conciliation process that helps change the perception of the parties involved to encourage a change in their behavior and facilitate the transition to a new conflict-free scenario.

Furthermore, it is essential to promote the transaction through effective communication, allowing the parties to express their willingness to find a solution. This stimulates the development of conflict towards the creation of situations that span different areas, such as economic, social and peaceful, where people can maximize the use of creative solutions.

With these actions, education can be promoted that allows the person who feels oppressed to recognize the causes of the perceived exploitation or abuse. This, evidently, leads to self-recognition of its transformative capacity and sows hope as a starting point towards a change in the situation.

Finally, it is worth highlighting that through confrontation through dialogue, protest and non-violence, we seek to generate a change in the unequal circumstances of interaction that the parties involved in conflict maintain with the aim of making them more equitable. Thus, in the search for alternatives to resolve conflicts, whether through a third instance or not, we move from a static state (also known as *non-peaceful*) to a dynamic or peaceful one.

Future lines of research

In carrying out this research, a number of limitations have been identified and considered that could be addressed in future research. For example, it would be beneficial to extend the analysis to a qualitative scenario, where management personnel are involved to understand their perspective on the perception of conflict among the personnel under their charge, which would allow us to know their points of view and the possible strategies that could be implemented. to address conflict and promote a harmonious and violence-free work environment.

Another aspect to consider as a limitation, although no less important, is to guarantee that the subjects in the sample have the advice of the researcher during the process of completing the questionnaire with the purpose of ensuring optimal conditions to complete the questionnaire and resolve any doubts they may have. may arise.

Finally, the results of this research could be used to contrast with future studies. In fact, based on the resulting analysis, effective strategies could be designed to address the causes of conflict in the education sector.

References

- Benítez, M., Guerra, JM, Medina, FJ and Munduate , L. (2008). The important of supervisor support to buffer the link between task conflict and relationship conflict : a longitudinal study . In *IACM 21st Annual Conference Paper* .
- Bernard, T. (1983). *The consensus-conflict debate : Form and content in social theories* . Columbia University Press .
- Casado, LC (2017). *Burnout, conflict, work environment and other organizational factors in nursing assistants working in nursing homes* (doctoral thesis). University of the Basque Country.
- Coser, LA, Blass, B., Betancourt, R., Ibarra, F. and Sarto, MS (1961). *The functions of social conflict* . Fund of Economic Culture.
- De Dreu , C. K. and Weingart , L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict , team performance, and team member satisfaction : a meta- analysis . *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 88 (4), 741.
- Deutsch , M. (1973). The resolution of conflict : Constructive and destructive processes . *American Behavioral Scientist* , 17 (2), 248-248.
- Friedman, R.A., Tidd , S.T., Currall , S.C. and Tsai , J.C. (2000). que goes around comes around : The impact of personal conflict styles on work conflict and stress. *International Journal of Conflict Management* , 11 (1), 32-55.
- González, N. (2017). *Study of the possible causes of discomfort among secondary school teachers since their initial training* (doctoral thesis). Complutense University of Madrid.
- Hernández-Sampieri, R., Fernández-Collado, C. and Baptista-Lucio, P. (2010). *Investigation methodology* . McGraw-Hill.
- Janssen, O., Van de Vliert , E. and West, M. (2004). The bright and dark sides of individual and group innovation : A special issue introduction . *Journal of Organizational Behavior* , 25 (2), 129-145.
- Jehn , K. A. (1995). To multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict . *Administrative Science Quartely* , 50 , 256-283.
- Jehn , K. A. (1997). A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups . *Administrative Science Quarterly* , 42 (3), 530-557.

- Jehn , K. A. and Chatman , J. A. (2000). The influence of proportional and perceptual conflict composition on team performance. *International Journal of Conflict Management* , 11 (1), 56-73.
- Jehn , K.A. and Mannix , E. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict : A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal* , 44 (2), 238-251.
- Lorenzo, P. L. (1995). Main theories about social conflict. *Norba : Magazine of History* , (15), 237-254.
- Malinowski, B., Alier, J., & Alier, M. T. (1982). *Crime and habit in the wild society* . Ariel.
- Mañas, MA and Díaz-Fúnez, PA (2009). Conflict, an opportunity to improve performance in work groups. In J. Boada (coord.), *Conflict resolution in companies and organizations* (69-84) . Piramide Publishing.
- Medina, FJ, Munduate , L., Martínez, I., Dorado, MA and Mañas, MA (2004). Positive effects of the activation of task conflict on the climate of work teams. *Journal of Social Psychology* , 19 (1), 3-15.
- Mercado, A. and González, G. (2008). Conflict theory in contemporary society . *Public Spaces* , 11 (21), 196-221.
- Merton, R. (1992). *Theory and social structures* . Fund of Economic Culture.
- Munduate , L. and Martínez, JM (2004). *Conflict and negotiation* . Pyramid.
- Murnighan , J. K. and Conlon , D. E. (1991). The dynamics of intense work groups : A study of British string quartets . *Administrative Science Quarterly* , 36 (2), 165-186
- Olson-Buchanan, J.B. and Boswell , W.R. (2001). Voicing discontent : The role of employees loyalty and informality . *Academy of Management Proceedings* , (1), 1-6.
- Pérez, EGS, Medina, DEM and Caraveo, MDCS (2015). Role conflict in university professors who are members of academic bodies. *Educational Profiles* , 37 (147), 103-125.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1949). Functionalism : A protest . *American Anthropologist* , 51 (2), 320-323.
- Rojo, M.I. (2019). The perception of conflict in secondary education teachers: case study. *AZARBE , International Journal of Social Work and Welfare* , (8), 27-38.
- Ross, M. (1989). Relationship of implicit theories to the construction of personal histories. *Psychological Review* , 96 (2), 341.

Turner, M.E. and Pratkanis , A. (1994). Social identity maintenance prescriptions for preventing groupthink : Reducing identity protection and enhancement intellectual conflict . *International Journal of Conflict Management* , 5 (3), 254-270.

West, M. A. (2001). The human team : Basic motivations and innovations . In N. Anderson, DS Ones, H.K. Sinangil and C. Viswesvaran (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology* (vol. 2) (pp. 270-288). SAGE.

| Contribution Role | Author(s) |
|---|--|
| Conceptualization | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez 50% Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla 50% |
| Methodology | Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán |
| Software | Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán |
| Validation | Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán 70% Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla 30% |
| Formal Analysis | Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán 70% Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla 30% |
| Investigation | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez 25% Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla 75% |
| Resources | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez 50% Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla 50% |
| Data curation | Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán |
| Writing - Preparation of the original draft | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez 34% Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán 33% Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla 33% |
| Writing - Review and editing | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez 34% Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán 33% Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla 33% |
| Display | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez 34% Ulises Osbaldo de la Cruz Guzmán 33% Fabiola Jazmín Gómez Padilla 33% |
| Supervision | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez |
| Project management | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez |
| Fund acquisition | Blanca Noemí Silva Gutiérrez |

Annexes

Annex 1. Letter of consent

The purpose of this consent letter is to provide participants with the information regarding the questionnaire they are kindly requested to respond to. The purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate situations of conflict between teachers and students, the perceptions and styles of coping with conflict on the part of teachers.

Your participation in this study is free and voluntary, and you may request to be excluded from this research and that your interventions not be considered in this research without prior justification or detriment to you.

The confidentiality of your identity will be protected by the following measures:

1. The surveys will be anonymous and only the responsible research group will have access to the data provided in them.
2. The interviews will receive a code for each participant, which will only be known to those responsible for this study and will be carried out in a favorable environment that encourages communication and the anonymity chosen by the participant.

In the general analysis of the data, a coding structure will be used to identify the information that emerges, its belonging to the instrument and the moment in which it was carried out. Given the characteristics of the study, the data will be used only in academic research instances and those typical of investigative dissemination.

Real names will not be used in the presentation of results.

Likewise, the responsible research group assumes a commitment to confidentiality to protect the identity of all those involved in this study.

If you participate in this research, you do so under your express informed consent that you sign and authorize.

SIGNATURE OF THE PARTICIPANT TEACHER

Appendix 2

CONFLICT RESOLUTION SCALE (ESOC)

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. SEX: <input type="radio"/> Female <input type="radio"/> Male | 2. AGE: _ ____ years |
| 3. Civil status: <input type="radio"/> Single <input type="radio"/> Married <input type="radio"/> Widowed <input type="radio"/> Free Union | 4. Weekly workload: |
| 5. ACADEMIC LEVEL: (graduated) <input type="radio"/> Bachelor's <input type="radio"/> Master's Degree | 6. Teaching experience: <input type="radio"/> Less than 5 years <input type="radio"/> Between 6 and 10 years <input type="radio"/> Between 11 and 15 years <input type="radio"/> Between 16 and 20 years <input type="radio"/> Between 21 and 25 years <input type="radio"/> More than 26 years |
| 7. Appointment: <input type="radio"/> Full time <input type="radio"/> Subject teacher | 8. Department where the highest workload is taught: <input type="radio"/> |

These pages contain a series of short sentences that allow you to reflect on the conflicts that arise in the classroom, their causes and coping styles. To do this, you must indicate to what extent each of the sentences below respond to how you feel, think or act. There are five answers for each sentence. Enter the number that corresponds to your choice.

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rara vez o nunca es mi caso. 2. Pocas veces es mi caso. 3. A veces es mi caso. 4. Muchas veces es mi caso. 5. Con mucha frecuencia o siempre es mi caso. |
|---|

| PERCEPTION OF CONFLICT | Options | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1.- In the relationship between teacher and student, it is inevitable to have conflicts | | | | | |
| 2.- Conflicts are opportunities for change | | | | | |
| 3.- In a conflict one party wins and another loses | | | | | |
| 4.- Conflicts generate mental and emotional exhaustion | | | | | |
| 5.- Conflict leads us to personal enrichment | | | | | |
| 6.- I identify when a student feels dissatisfied with a situation | | | | | |

| CAUSES OF THE CONFLICT | Options | | | | |
|--|---------|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7.- Ideologies and values derived from the generational change between teachers and students | | | | | |
| 8.- Sexual and gender diversity in students | | | | | |
| 9.- Respect for the authority of the teacher | | | | | |
| 10.- Student interest in the class | | | | | |
| 11.- Communication | | | | | |



| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 12.- Interaction styles | | | | | |
| 13.- Qualifications | | | | | |
| 14.- Rules proposed by the teacher in the classroom | | | | | |
| 15.- Student apathy | | | | | |

| CONFLICT SOLUTION SCALE | Options | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16.- I know how to deal with the most unpleasant problems in the classroom | | | | | |
| 17.- I try not to hurt the feelings of the student body | | | | | |
| 18.- It is difficult for me to start new modalities in teaching | | | | | |
| 19.- I have problems controlling myself when I get angry | | | | | |
| 20.- After facing a problem, I evaluate whether my actions were positive or negative | | | | | |
| 21.- I usually control myself in very difficult situations that arise in the classroom | | | | | |
| 22.- It is difficult for me to adapt to new situations | | | | | |
| 23.- I can handle stressful situations without getting too nervous | | | | | |
| 24.- My students trust me with their problems | | | | | |
| 25.- I am impulsive, and that brings me problems | | | | | |
| 26.- When a student raises their voice at me, I do it too | | | | | |
| 27.- I am good at understanding the feelings of the student body | | | | | |
| 28.- It is easy for me to adapt to new situations | | | | | |
| 29.- My colleagues tell me to lower my voice when I argue | | | | | |
| 30.- When I solve a problem I like to know what was good and what was bad. | | | | | |
| 31.- I know how to stay calm in difficult situations | | | | | |
| 32.- I am unable to understand how the students feel | | | | | |
| 33.- I have strong and intense reactions that are difficult to control | | | | | |
| 34.- Making faces or mimes brings me problems | | | | | |
| 35.- I give importance to the evaluation of my behaviors to improve | | | | | |
| 36.- I care about what can happen to the students | | | | | |
| 37.- I have a tendency to explode with anger easily. | | | | | |
| 38.- When I argue with a student I usually speak loudly. | | | | | |
| 39.- I constantly analyze my behaviors | | | | | |
| 40.- I believe in my ability to face problems | | | | | |
| 41.- When a student annoys me, I can't stand it and I react | | | | | |
| 42.- When I argue with a student I try to understand why they act that way. | | | | | |
| 43.- I have never been able to control my anger | | | | | |
| 44.- After solving a problem with the students, I evaluate whether the response was appropriate or not. | | | | | |
| 45.- I usually control myself in difficult situations | | | | | |
| 46.- I consider it important to know how the students feel | | | | | |
| 47.- When I feel bad I don't want to know about anything or anyone | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 48.- I usually make gestures when I don't like something | | | | | |
| 49.- When students ask me something and I don't want to answer, I make gestures | | | | | |
| 50.- When my answers do not solve a problem I try to evaluate what went wrong | | | | | |