



**Arofat SALIMOVA**<sup>a</sup> 

<sup>a</sup>*Uzbekistan National Pedagogical  
University named after Nizami  
Independent Researcher*

## STRUCTURAL AND DYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PEDAGOGICAL CONFLICT: A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS AND CLASSIFICATION

**Abstract.** *This article presents a theoretical analysis and systematic classification of the structural and dynamic characteristics of pedagogical conflict. The structural components of conflict—subject, object, matter, conditions, and consequences—are delineated alongside its dynamic stages: pre-conflict tension, incident, escalation, resolution, and post-conflict period. A typological classification of conflicts within the pedagogical relationship system (teacher–student, teacher–parent, teacher–administration, and inter-student) is developed, with each type characterized according to its distinctive features, typical causes, and recommended resolution approaches. The functional and dysfunctional effects of pedagogical conflict are examined, and constructive resolution strategies—including Thomas’s five conflict handling modes and peer mediation—are evaluated for their applicability in educational settings. The analysis demonstrates that the outcome of pedagogical conflict is determined less by its inherent nature than by the teacher’s competence in managing it, and that systematic understanding of conflict structure and dynamics is essential for effective pedagogical intervention. The findings conclude with theoretical and practical recommendations for pedagogical conflict management in contemporary educational institutions.*

**Keywords:** *pedagogical conflict, structural components, conflict dynamics, conflict typology, constructive resolution, conflict competence, teacher–student relations, educational psychology.*

### INTRODUCTION

Pedagogical relationships in contemporary educational systems are becoming increasingly complex. A confluence of personal, social, and institutional factors intersects within educational environments to generate conflict-prone situations that challenge

both teachers and learners. Pedagogical conflict—understood as a clash of opposing goals, interests, or values between participants in the educational process—is an inherent feature of school and university life, representing not merely a problem to be eliminated but a potential catalyst for pedagogical development and qualitative transformation of interpersonal relationships (Coser, 1956:56).

While conflict as a general phenomenon has been studied extensively from philosophical, sociological, and psychological perspectives, the systematic examination of its structural composition and dynamic development within specifically pedagogical contexts remains an underexplored area of inquiry. The inability to identify the structural elements of a conflict situation or to recognize its developmental stage renders any attempt at resolution arbitrary and ineffective. A teacher who intervenes at the wrong stage, or who addresses the surface-level object of conflict while ignoring its deeper psychological subject, is likely to exacerbate rather than resolve the situation (Rybakova, 1991:23).

This article undertakes a systematic theoretical analysis of the structural components and dynamic stages of pedagogical conflict, presents a typological classification of conflicts within different pedagogical relationship systems, examines their functional and dysfunctional consequences, and evaluates constructive strategies for their management.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

### *Theoretical Foundations*

The theoretical foundations of this study draw upon several seminal contributions to conflict theory. Coser (1956:56) established that conflict can serve an integrative function within social systems, promoting adaptation and institutional flexibility rather than necessarily leading to disruption. This insight has been particularly influential in educational psychology, where it has supported the reconceptualization of pedagogical conflict as a potential resource for learning and growth rather than merely a disturbance to be suppressed.

Thomas (1976:905) developed the most widely applied analytical framework for understanding conflict behavior, identifying five distinct conflict handling modes—competing, accommodating, avoiding, compromising, and collaborating—arranged along two dimensions: assertiveness and cooperativeness. This model has proven particularly

valuable in pedagogical contexts, where the teacher's habitual conflict style significantly influences the frequency, intensity, and outcomes of classroom conflicts. Rybakova (1991:42) extended this framework to the specific domain of educational conflict, identifying three fundamental types: activity conflict (arising from academic tasks and performance expectations), behavioral conflict (stemming from disciplinary issues), and relationship conflict (emerging from disruptions to mutual respect and trust).

Johnson and Johnson (2009:40) articulated the theory of constructive conflict, demonstrating that structured intellectual disagreement within learning environments promotes cognitive development, critical thinking, and deeper understanding. Their research provided empirical evidence that conflict, when channeled through cooperative frameworks, enhances rather than undermines educational outcomes. Within the Uzbek scholarly tradition, Yo'ldosheva (2020:78) and Nazarov (2019:45) have examined interpersonal tensions in school settings, while Toshmatova (2021:90) investigated the relationship between teacher competence and conflict management effectiveness.

## METHODOLOGY

The research employed a systematic theoretical approach combining literature analysis, structural classification, and comparative synthesis. The methodological framework integrated systems theory (analyzing conflict as a holistic system), activity theory (emphasizing the active role of conflict subjects), person-centered pedagogy (Rogers, Amonashvili), and conflict management theory (Deutsch, Thomas). Research methods included theoretical analysis, systematization, and comparative review of scholarly literature across Russian, Uzbek, and international academic traditions (Danesh, 2006:85).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Structural Components of Pedagogical Conflict*

The analysis identified five essential structural components that constitute the architecture of any pedagogical conflict situation. Understanding these components is a prerequisite for accurate conflict diagnosis and the design of effective intervention strategies.

*Table 1. Structural Components of Pedagogical Conflict*

<b>Component</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Pedagogical Example</b>
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Participants in the conflict</b>	<b>Teacher vs. student; parent vs. administration</b>
<b>Object</b>	<b>Concrete situation around which conflict arises</b>	<b>A grade, a disciplinary decision, scheduling</b>
<b>Matter</b>	<b>Deep psychological content underlying the dispute</b>	<b>Sense of injustice, need for recognition, autonomy</b>
<b>Conditions</b>	<b>Environmental and contextual factors</b>	<b>Class size, school culture, power dynamics</b>
<b>Consequences</b>	<b>Outcomes: constructive or destructive</b>	<b>Improved relationship vs. emotional withdrawal</b>

A critical analytical distinction must be drawn between the object and the matter of pedagogical conflict. Parties typically dispute at the object level—a grade, a classroom rule, a homework assignment—while the genuine source of tension resides at the deeper level of the matter: a student’s sense of injustice, a parent’s feeling of exclusion, or a teacher’s perception of professional disrespect. Interventions that address only the surface object while ignoring the underlying matter produce superficial resolutions that are vulnerable to recurrence (Nazarov, 2019:67).

### *Dynamic Stages of Pedagogical Conflict*

*Table 2. Dynamic Stages of Pedagogical Conflict*

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Optimal Intervention</b>
<b>Pre-conflict</b>	<b>Latent tension, accumulating dissatisfaction</b>	<b>Early detection, preventive dialogue</b>
<b>Incident</b>	<b>Triggering event; open confrontation begins</b>	<b>De-escalation, immediate containment</b>
<b>Escalation</b>	<b>Intensification; emotional involvement deepens</b>	<b>Structured negotiation, third-party mediation</b>
<b>Resolution</b>	<b>Agreement reached; constructive or imposed</b>	<b>Collaborative problem-solving (win-win)</b>
<b>Post-conflict</b>	<b>Relationship restoration; lessons drawn</b>	<b>Follow-up, reflective practice, trust repair</b>

The post-conflict stage is frequently neglected in pedagogical practice, yet its importance cannot be overstated. Teachers often consider a conflict resolved once an overt agreement has been reached, failing to recognize that the emotional residue of conflict can persist and undermine future interactions. Without deliberate relationship restoration work, superficially resolved conflicts may generate latent resentment that later erupts with greater intensity (Slasyonin & Kashirin, 2002:320). The most effective pedagogical

intervention occurs during the pre-conflict stage, when early detection of accumulating tension allows preventive action before open confrontation develops.

***Typology of Pedagogical Conflicts***

*Table 3. Typology of Conflicts in the Pedagogical Relationship System*

<b>Conflict Type</b>	<b>Primary Causes</b>	<b>Distinctive Features</b>
<b>Teacher–Student</b>	<b>Academic demands, discipline, perceived unfairness</b>	<b>Most prevalent; power asymmetry is central</b>
<b>Teacher–Parent</b>	<b>Differing expectations, communication gaps</b>	<b>Often secondary; the child’s welfare is contested</b>
<b>Teacher–Admin.</b>	<b>Bureaucratic demands vs. pedagogical autonomy</b>	<b>Institutional power dynamics dominate</b>
<b>Inter-Student</b>	<b>Peer competition, bullying, group dynamics</b>	<b>Requires teacher as mediator, not party</b>

Teacher–student conflict is the most extensively researched and most prevalent type. Rybakova (1991:67) identified three fundamental subtypes: activity conflict (arising from academic tasks and performance evaluation), behavioral conflict (rooted in disciplinary issues), and relationship conflict (emerging when mutual respect and trust are disrupted). This tripartite classification remains highly relevant to contemporary pedagogical practice.

***Functional and Dysfunctional Consequences***

The analysis reveals that pedagogical conflict produces dual-potential outcomes. When managed constructively, conflict can promote open dialogue about problems, develop students’ autonomy and self-advocacy skills, prompt teachers to critically re-evaluate their methods, and foster a climate of fairness and democratic participation in the classroom. When managed poorly or ignored, conflict can diminish academic motivation, generate psychological stress and anxiety in students, contribute to emotional burnout in teachers, and promote social fragmentation and isolation within the classroom (Slastyonin & Kashirin, 2002:415).

Research consistently demonstrates that the outcome of pedagogical conflict depends less on its inherent characteristics than on the teacher’s competence in managing it (Johnson & Johnson, 2009:42). Teachers with high conflict competence successfully restore relationships and maintain educational continuity even after intense confrontations. Thomas’s (1976:920) collaboration strategy (win-win) has been shown to produce the

most sustainable outcomes in long-term pedagogical relationships, while peer mediation programs have demonstrated effectiveness in developing students' social competence and empathy (Danesh, 2006:158).

## CONCLUSION

This theoretical analysis has established that pedagogical conflict is an inherent and unavoidable component of the educational process, one that is neither intrinsically negative nor positive but whose outcome depends entirely on how it is understood and managed. The systematic delineation of five structural components—subject, object, matter, conditions, and consequences—provides practitioners with a diagnostic framework for analyzing conflict situations with precision and depth.

The identification of five dynamic stages—pre-conflict tension, incident, escalation, resolution, and post-conflict period—equips educators with a temporal framework for determining the optimal moment and mode of intervention. The finding that early intervention during the pre-conflict stage is most effective, and that the post-conflict stage requires deliberate relationship restoration work, carries direct implications for pedagogical practice.

The typological classification of conflicts across four relationship domains—teacher–student, teacher–parent, teacher–administration, and inter-student—demonstrates that each type requires a differentiated approach informed by its distinctive features and causal mechanisms. Collectively, these findings underscore that conflict competence—the ability to detect, understand, and constructively manage conflict—must be recognized as an essential component of contemporary teacher professional preparation. The integration of conflict management training into teacher education curricula, the implementation of conflict monitoring systems in schools, and the development of mediation culture among students are recommended as priority directions for improving the socio-psychological climate of educational institutions.

## REFERENCES

1. Coser, L. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. Free Press.
2. Danesh, H. B. (2006). Towards an integrative theory of peace education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 3(1), 55–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17400200500532151>
3. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). Energizing learning: The instructional power of conflict. *Educational Researcher*, 38(1), 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08330540>

4. Nazarov, O. (2019). Maktab muhitidagi ziddiyatlar va ularning o'quvchi shaxsiga ta'siri [Conflicts in the school environment and their impact on student personality]. Fan.
5. Rybakova, M. M. (1991). Konflikt i vzaimodeystviye v pedagogicheskom protsesse [Conflict and interaction in the pedagogical process]. Prosveshcheniye.
6. Slastyonin, V. A., & Kashirin, V. P. (2002). Psikhologiya i pedagogika [Psychology and pedagogy]. Akademiya.
7. Yuldosheva, Sh. (2020). Ta'lim muassasalarida shaxslararo munosabatlar psixologiyasi [Psychology of interpersonal relationships in educational institutions]. TDPU.
8. Mamatkulova, N. (2025). Kream strategiyasida kreativlikning o' rni va mohiyati. «ACTA NUUZ», 1(1.11. 1), 120-122.
9. Mamatkulova, N. (2021). Learner-Centered Approach In Developing A Foreign Language Lexical Competence. *Philology Matters*, 2021(2).
10. Mamatkulova, N. (2021, April). The Importance of Individual Approach in the Development of Lexical Competencies in a Foreign Language. In Конференции.
11. Mamatkulova, N. (2025). Oliy ta'limda KREAM strategiyasi yordamida darslarni tashkil etishning prinsiplari va usullari. *The Lingua Spectrum*, 4(1), 895-903.
12. Mamatkulova, N. (2025). Enhancing Students'ecolinguistic Awareness as a Key Educational Priority in the 21st Century. *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, 152-166.
13. Mamatkulova, N., & Nilufar, M. (2020). Independent study skills as a key to success in higher education system. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 8(10 Part II), 96-100.
14. Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 889–935). Rand McNally.
15. Toshmatova, G. (2021). Pedagog kompetentsiyasi va konfliktni boshqarish [Teacher competence and conflict management]. *Pedagogika va Psixologiya Ilmiy Jurnal*, (3), 88–95.
16. Khujayev, B. (2022). Pedagogik konfliktlarning oldini olish strategiyalari [Strategies for preventing pedagogical conflicts]. SamDU.