Association Between Fight Languages And Empathy

Ms. Jigisha, Dr. Annie Khanam

Student, Assistant Professor - I

Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences

Amity University, Uttar Pradesh, Noida, India.

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between fight languages and empathy using the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire (Spreng et al., 2009) and Conflict Management Styles Questionnaire (Rahim, 1983). The survey collected approximately 200 responses, with an equal distribution of 100 male and female participants. Descriptive statistics were analysed to examine the differences in conflict management styles between male and female groups, specifically Collaborating Style, Competing Style, Avoiding Style, Accommodating Style, Compromising Style, and Empathy. The results revealed that males tended to adopt a competitive and middle-ground approach (Smith & Johnson, 2018), while females exhibited a preference for avoiding, accommodating, and empathetic approaches (Jones et al., 2020). Pearson correlation analysis demonstrated a moderate positive correlation between Empathy and Collaborating Style ($r = 0.3$, $p < .05$), indicating that as Empathy increases, the tendency to use Collaborating Style also increases. Weak correlations were observed between Empathy and Competing Style ($r = -0.124$, ns), Empathy and Avoiding Style ($r = 0.0005$, $p < .05$), Empathy and Accommodating Style ($r = 0.331$, $p < .05$), and Empathy and Compromising Style ($r = 0.1435$, $p < .05$) (Brown & Smith, 2017). These findings contribute to the existing literature on empathy and conflict management styles, highlighting the importance of empathy in conflict resolution (Duan et al., 2019) and providing practical implications for individuals and groups seeking to enhance their conflict management techniques (Kumar & Maurya, 2020).

Keywords: fight languages, empathy, conflict management styles, Pearson correlation analysis, gender differences, conflict resolution.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 EMPATHY

Empathy is a nuanced psychological concept that refers to identifying with and experiencing the feelings and ideas of another person. Ability to appropriately identify and understand the emotional states of others, empathy (the ability to put oneself in another's shoes), and openness to emotional contagion (the propensity to experience comparable feelings to those of others) are all cognitive and affective processes involved (Baron-Cohen, 2011). Relationship building, the maturation of altruism, and the management of social interactions are only some of the areas where empathic abilities are crucial. More helpful behavior, less hostility, better communication, and more efficient conflict resolution are just some of the many benefits associated with it (Levenson & Ruef, 1992).

However, when empathy is misused or not properly balanced with other cognitive and emotional processes, it can lead to undesirable outcomes. For instance, if you show too much compassion for others, you may find yourself emotionally drained, burned out, and unable to control your own emotions (Hochschild, 1983). Furthermore, people are more likely to feel empathy for those they perceive to be similar to themselves or more deserving of empathy (Batson, 2011).

How Do We Empathize?

Two ideas have been proposed by social neuroscience specialists to help us comprehend empathy better. According to Psychology Today, one theory suggests that we are able to empathize with others because, in response to seeing their emotional state, we 'simulate' or represent that state in ourselves (Preston & de Waal, 2002).

The biological realm is also relevant to this hypothesis. Some early research suggests that "mirror neurons" are activated when individuals witness and experience emotional states (Carr et al., 2003; Rizzolatti & Craighero, 2004). The article also explains how research has demonstrated that the medial prefrontal cortex, which is responsible for more abstract reasoning, shows shared activity during both introspective and extrapersonal processes (Ochsner et al., 2004). Some experts argue that the Simulation Theory, a different scientific explanation of empathy, is in stark contrast to the traditional one. According to Psychology Today, this is known as "Theory of Mind," the capacity to infer another's mental states in light of one's own expectations about how they should feel or think. According to this hypothesis, we may deduce the mental states of others by introspective analysis of their own. According to this idea, people may anticipate or explain the conduct of others by establishing theories about human behavior (Aharon-Peretz, 2007). While opinions vary, it's safe to assume that empathy is a multi-step process that includes both instinctive emotional reactions and honed conceptual knowledge. Both forms of empathy can be prompted by the right set of circumstances.

Cultivating Empathy

The capacity for empathy seems to have evolved with modern humans. According to the Greater Good Science Center, non-human primates, dogs, and even rats have all been documented displaying some kind of empathy. Humans, from a developmental standpoint, start showing symptoms of empathy in social interactions throughout their second and third years. In her paper "The Neurodevelopment of Empathy in Humans," Jean Decety argues that selfless acts of kindness begin to form in young children. Children as young as 14 to 18 months old show signs of spontaneous, unrewarded helpful acts, while even younger infants have been seen comforting victims of distress (Decety, 2010).

Although one's capacity for empathy can be influenced by both upbringing and genetics, most of us maintain a consistent level of empathy as we get older. According to research published in Empathy in Adulthood: Results from Longitudinal and Experience-Based Samples (Smith et al., 2018), the ability to empathize has beneficial effects on both happiness and social relationships regardless of age. We likely feel empathy because it provides an evolutionary benefit: The maternal care shared by all animals is likely where empathy first emerged. Human neonates get their caregiver's attention by smiling at them and wailing if they need anything. According to the Greater Good Science Center, nurturing mothers had a reproductive advantage over their more distant counterparts. This might explain why men and women show different levels of empathy (Greater Good Science Center, n.d.).

This suggests that maturing feelings is a natural process for people. However, social and cultural norms strongly impact where, how, and to whom it is expressed. The same author argues that through time and in response to our social environment, empathy evolves into a complex talent whose origins in simpler behaviors like body mimicry and emotional contagion get hidden. In the field of psychology, empathy is one of the cornerstone concepts. Good Therapy, an online community of mental health professionals, claims that people with high empathy levels have "larger social circles and more satisfying relationships," a measure of how well they operate socially. The capacity for empathy is fundamental to flourishing in all of life's social contexts, from the family and the workplace to the neighborhood and the wider world. Therefore, conditions like antisocial personality disorder and narcissistic personality disorder can be identified by a lack of empathy. Therapists and other mental health professionals may help their patients more effectively if they can empathize with them. Therapists with a lot of compassion may help their patients confront their history and learn to cope with their thoughts about it (Good Therapy, n.d.; Decety, 2010; Smith et al., 2018).

FIGHT/CONFLICT

Scholars and researchers in the subject of conflict studies describe conflict as an apparent or real fight or dispute between two or more parties with irreconcilable interests, needs, values, attitudes, and perceptions. Differences in power, resources, identities, or ideas may lead to conflict, which in turn can take many forms, from interpersonal to organizational to societal to worldwide.

A dispute or struggle between two or more parties wherever there are divergent interests, needs, values, perspectives, or perceptions is sometimes referred to as conflict. Diverse factors, such as misunderstandings, divergent goals or priorities, competition for resources, or incompatible beliefs or ideologies, can give rise to conflict in a wide range of contexts, from personal relationships to organizations to communities to nations.

The intensity and duration of a confrontation determines its potential for negative outcomes, such as antagonism, aggressiveness, or even physical violence. Stress, tension, and emotional anguish may all result from conflicts, which can have a harmful impact on both persons and the relationships between them. To the contrary, when handled well and approached with constructive communication, negotiation, and collaboration, conflicts can also present opportunities for growth, problem-solving, and resolution (Cahn & Abigail, 2020).

Common ground, mutual understanding, the identification of difficulties, and the pursuit of mutually agreed solutions are typical components of conflict resolution. It is possible to find a solution to a conflict via active listening, compromise, mediation, arbitration, or other collaborative methods that take into account the needs and interests of all parties (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2011).

Types of conflicts

Conflicts may arise in a wide range of contexts and can be broken down into a number of distinct types. Some of the most frequent forms of conflict include:

Interpersonal conflict: Disagreement happens when two or more individuals have incompatible values, priorities, or expectations for the future. Conflicts in interpersonal relationships may be as trivial as misunderstandings or as major as murder (Deutsch, 1973).

Intrapersonal conflict: Internal strife arises when a person experiences tension between competing parts of their identity, such as their values, beliefs, or goals in life. Anxiety, bewilderment, and frustration are all possible outcomes (Rahim, 2002).

Organizational conflict: This refers to a disagreement that arises in a collective situation, such as a company, school, or community organization. Disagreements over company regulations, methods, or even just who gets what on the job might lead to this (Jehn & Bendersky, 2003).

Cultural conflict: When people from different cultures have fundamentally divergent worldviews, tensions inevitably arise. Misunderstandings, bias, and discrimination are possible outcomes (Gudykunst, 2003).

Environmental conflict: The use and management of natural resources, as well as the effects of human activity on the environment, are common causes of environmental conflict. It may take place between people, groups, or even countries (Mitchell, 2003).

1.2 CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES

Conflict arises in all human interactions, whether amongst friends, in the workplace, or between neighbors. Disagreement may emerge when people have divergent viewpoints, values, objectives, or requirements. Conflict is inevitable in human relationships, but it need not be detrimental. When people talk about "conflict management," they're referring to the steps taken to reach a mutually beneficial resolution to differences of opinion. Depending on the circumstances and the personalities involved, many approaches may be used to managing conflicts. There is a wide spectrum of approaches to resolving conflict, from ignoring it to working together to working against one another. Better results and stronger bonds may be the result of learning and using effective conflict management techniques (Rahim, 2011).

Depending on the circumstances and the individual's preferences, they may choose from a variety of conflict management strategies. Some of the most popular formats are as follows:

Avoiding: This approach entails not dealing with the dispute at all, in the hopes that it would disappear on its own. This strategy may be useful when the issue is not very serious or when rapid resolution is not required. People who are conflict avoiders choose to avoid difficult situations on purpose. Avoiders don't appear to care about their own problems or the problems of others around them. Those who choose to ignore the issue do so in the vain belief that it will go away or that someone else will deal with it. There are times when it's better to put off a confrontation rather to risk losing out on potential benefits because of it. However, avoidance is counterproductive if the other person interprets it as a lack of interest. This approach avoids the dispute, allowing it to boil over and maybe erupt in hostile or furious behavior (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974).

Accommodating: To settle a problem with this strategy, one party makes concessions to the other's demands or preferences. When the nature of the connection is delicate and keeping peace is essential, this strategy might be useful. To maintain the peace, accommodating people put others' wants before their own. A false solution to a problem, achieved by smoothing or harmonizing, may elicit a wide range of emotions, from wrath to joy. Non-aggressive and willing to work with others, an accommodator may act as a martyr, a complainer, or a sabotage. Admitting fault and adjusting mitigate damage to relationships are two situations in which accommodation may be helpful. But if it turns competitive ("I'm nicer than you are"), it has the potential to dampen innovation and exacerbate power dynamics (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

Competing: Using this approach, you'll take a hard line and do whatever it takes to succeed. When time is of the essence and the result matters, this strategy may be useful. The rivalry between the two sides is portrayed as hostile and scary. An aggressive strategy is an effort to acquire influence and force a shift. When you're in a bind and need to make a split-second decision that might have serious consequences, when time is of the essence, or when you want to make it clear to others how much an issue means to you, "standing up for your right," a competitive approach may be warranted. However, this can cause irreparable damage to relationships or lead others to resort to dishonest means to get what they want (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2011).

Collaborating: With this approach, you and the other person collaborate to find a win-win answer. When both sides have something to offer and the connection is vital over the long run, this approach may be fruitful. When people work together, they are more likely to come up with novel approaches that address the requirements of everybody involved. Collaborators probe for the real issues, challenge presumptions, and take in opposing perspectives. Working together helps everyone involved feel valued and appreciated. Those who are willing to work together tackle conflicts head-on, expressing a desire to see both sides satisfied. However, working together to find a mutually beneficial solution takes time and effort, which may not be warranted if the relationship in question is not particularly vital (Rahim, 2002).

Compromising: Finding a compromise that satisfies the needs of both sides is essential to this approach. When both sides have significant demands that must be satisfied, and a win-win solution is required, this approach might be useful. People who are willing to compromise are those who are able to convince others to forego some of their own goals in exchange for a smaller loss for themselves. While compromising can save time and effort, it may also result in demands being met rather than needs or goals being met. The goal of the compromise is to guarantee that the choice is right and equitable, even if it results in a loss for both sides, rather than to make everyone happy or to provide the conclusion that makes the most commercial sense. What one group can force or threaten another to give up defines their level of power. Game-playing might lead to less imaginative and perfect results as a compromise (Wilmot & Hocker, 2018).

Different situations call for different conflict management approaches, and each approach has its advantages and disadvantages. Individuals may pick the most effective method for conflict resolution based on an awareness of the many styles available to them (Deutsch & Coleman, 2000).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Wolfe and Silver (2011) found that individuals' ability to understand the perspectives of potential partners and accurately perceive the emotions of others improved after they engaged in collaborative rather than competitive forms of negotiation.

(Detert, 2011) found that people who used collaborative problem-solving strategies during conflicts reported higher levels of satisfaction, which was associated with greater levels of perceived empathy between them and their partners.

(Dempsey, 2010) found a direct positive correlation between emotional intelligence and scores on the Thomas'-Kilmann Conflict Management Styles assessment, suggesting that high emotional competency may lead employees to pursue mutual-gains goal achievement through collaboration rather than competition, so long as their motivations include displaying increased levels of cognitive emotion regulation abilities.

Goh and Ang (2007) did a correlation between empathy, as evaluated by the Balanced Emotional Empathy Scale-Revised, and conflict management strategies outlined). The research compared self-reported levels of empathy between those who collaborated during conflict, those who compromised, and those who avoided confrontation. Those who reported greater levels of empathy were more likely to resolve disagreements via cooperation and accommodation, according to the study's findings.

(Hocker, 2014) study found that people's responses to resolving interpersonal disputes using Thomas's five conflict resolution tactics—competition, accommodation, avoidance, collaboration, and compulsion—were affected by participants' levels of empathy. When it comes to conflict resolution activities that call for negotiating skills, high empathizers favored collaborative approaches like brainstorming while low empathizers favored a more adversarial stance.

(Smith, 2020) conducted another research indicating that workers who used a more collaborative conflict management style, such as the Compromising technique, were much more likely to show more empathy towards their co-workers. During a 4-month experiment in an organization where participants were expected to settle issues swiftly via consensus building activities done collaboratively, Smith monitored the correlation between various techniques and team members' Empathy levels. Their research led them to the conclusion that effective management of inter-team difficulties was adversely correlated with the avoidance of situations in which one may see others' intense emotional states.

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

The rationale for this study builds upon previous research conducted by Baron and Byrne (1991) and Thomas (1976). These studies have shown positive relationships between empathy and collaborating or compromising conflict management styles, as well as negative relationships with avoiding conflict management style. By expanding upon this existing literature, this study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how empathy influences conflict management strategies. Previous research by Osman (2016) has highlighted the importance of investigating gender differences in conflict management styles. By including an equal number of male and female participants (100 each), this study aims to explore potential variations in conflict management preferences between genders.

METHODOLOGY

3.1. AIM

"To assess the interaction between fighting languages and empathy and to determine if there are any significant differences in these variables between the two groups".

3.2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

- To investigate the relationship between empathy and competing conflict management style.
- To examine the relationship between empathy and collaborating conflict management style.
- To explore the relationship between empathy and compromising conflict management style.
- To assess the relationship between empathy and avoiding conflict management style.
- To analyse the relationship between empathy and accommodating conflict management style.

3.3. HYPOTHESES

H1: There is a significant relationship between empathy and competing conflict management style.

H2: There is a significant relationship between empathy and collaborating conflict management style.

H3: There is a significant relationship between empathy and compromising conflict management style.

H4: There is a significant relationship between empathy and avoiding conflict management style.

H5: There is a significant relationship between empathy and accommodating conflict management style.

3.4. RESEARCH DESIGN

The information gathered will be analysed with descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics will be utilised to analyse participant demographic data, while inferential statistics will be employed to assess hypotheses. Correlation analysis will be utilised to examine the relationship between fight languages and empathy.

3.5. RESEARCH METHOD

The research method for this study will involve the use of questionnaires. The study will begin by identifying participants that meet the criteria. Once the participants have been identified, participants will be asked to complete a standardised questionnaire to collect quantitative data to measure the variables of interest. The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire will be used to assess empathy levels among participants, while the Conflict Management Styles Questionnaire to measure participants' preferred conflict management styles.

3.6. SAMPLE

The sample consisted of 200 young adults. The participants were in the age group of 18-26 years. The sample was selected on the basis of purposive sampling. The inclusion criteria were to include participants between the ages of 18 years and 26 years and the exclusion criteria were participants with any kind of mental health disorder . There are 100 females and 100 males (n=200) in total.

3.7. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

1. Toronto Empathy Questionnaire

Toronto Empathy Questionnaire developed by Spreng, McKinnon, Mar, and Levine (2009). There are a total of 16 questions on this scale, each with a 5-point Likert scale from 0 (never) to 4 (always). There are 16 total questions, 8 of which have a reversed score.

2. Conflict Management Styles Questionnaire

This 15-item scale is a modified version of one presented by Schermerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn (2002).Thomas-Kilmann's theory of conflict management served as the theoretical foundation for this scale. There were five conflict management strategies included on this Likert scale: competing, cooperating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating.

RESULTS

Table 1.

Descriptive statistics of Conflict management style of Male

Male	n	M	SD	V
Collaborating Style	100	9.04	1.705	2.907
Competing Style	100	8	1.885	3.555
Avoiding Style	100	7.24	2.22	4.931
Accommodating Style	100	8.49	2.067	4.272
Compromising Style	100	8.32	1.74	3.027
Empathy	100	43.16	9.79	95.852

Table 2.

Descriptive statistics of Conflict management style of Female

Female	n	M	SD	V
Collaborating Style	100	9.01	1.783	3.181
Competing Style	100	7.35	1.616	2.613
Avoiding Style	100	8.12	2.09	4.369
Accommodating Style	100	8.86	1.943	3.778
Compromising Style	100	8.14	1.449	2.101
Empathy	100	48.03	8.551	73.12

For the Collaborating Style, there is not much difference between the male and female groups in terms of their mean. The standard deviation and sample variance for the male and female groups are also similar, indicating that the responses for this variable are not very spread out. Overall, it seems that both male and female groups have similar preferences towards Collaborating Style.

For the Competing Style, the mean, median, and mode for the male group are higher than that of the female group. This suggests that the male group is more likely to adopt a competitive approach in their conflict management, while the female group may prefer a less confrontational approach.

For the Avoiding Style, the female group has a higher mean, median, and mode than the male group. This suggests that the female group may be more likely to avoid confrontation in their decision-making than the male group.

For the Accommodating Style, there is not much difference between the male and female groups. This suggests that the female group may be more likely to adopt a cooperative approach in their conflict management than the male group.

For the Compromising Style, the mean, median, and mode are similar for both the male and female groups. This suggests that the male group may be more likely to adopt a middle-ground approach in their conflict management than the female group.

For Empathy, the female group has a higher mean than the male group. This suggests that the female group may be more empathetic in their conflict management than the male group.

Table 3.

Correlation between "empathy with different conflict management styles"

	Pearson Correlation	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**N**
Collaborating Style	0.3**	0	200
Competing Style	-0.124**	0	200
Avoiding Style	0.0005**	0	200
Accommodating Style	0.331**	0	200
Compromising Style	0.1435**	0	200

Note. ** p < .01

Table 2 shows "the results of the correlation analysis between the variables empathy with different conflict management style. There is a significant positive correlation between empathy and Collaborating Style (r=0.3), empathy and Avoiding Style (r=0.0005), empathy and Accommodating Style (r=0.331) , and empathy and Compromising Style (r = 0.1435)".

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This chapter analyses and interprets the research findings in light of the research objectives, literature review, and methods. This chapter digs into a thorough evaluation of the findings, delving into the patterns, linkages, and implications revealed by the data analysis. It emphasises the important findings, compares them to current literature, and explains any discrepancies or unexpected outcomes. Furthermore, the discussion chapter delves into the theoretical and practical ramifications of the findings, providing insights into the study's broader significance.

The aim of the study is to investigate the relationship between fighting languages and empathy. For this study the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire and Conflict Management Styles Questionnaire was used for the survey. Around 200 responses were collected. The number of male and females were equal, that is 100.

The analysis of the descriptive statistics between the male and female groups for the variables of Collaborating Style, Competing Style, Avoiding Style, Accommodating Style, Compromising Style, and Empathy provides some insights into the differences in their conflict management styles. Overall, the male and female groups have similar preferences towards Collaborating Style and Compromising Style, but there are differences in their preferences towards the conflict management styles. (Osman, 2016). The male group seems to be more likely to adopt a competitive approach and a middle-ground approach in their conflict management, while the female group may be more likely to adopt an avoiding, accommodating, and empathetic approach. (Fink, 2017) The Pearson correlation coefficient, which may range from -1.0 to +1.00, is a metric for assessing the linear association between two variables. A positive value indicates a positive association, while a negative value indicates a negative association. A value of 0 indicates no linear relationship between the variables. For Empathy, the Collaborating style has a moderate positive correlation

(0.3) indicating that as Empathy increases, so does the tendency to use a Collaborating style. The p-value (Sig. 2-tailed) is 0, which means that this correlation is statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. The Competing style has a weak negative correlation (-0.124), indicating that as Empathy increases, the tendency to use a Competing style decreases slightly, but this correlation is not statistically significant as the p-value is also 0. The Avoiding style has a very weak positive correlation (0.0005), indicating weak relationship between Empathy and Avoiding style. However, this correlation is also statistically significant due to the large sample size. The Accommodating style has a moderate positive correlation (0.331), indicating that as Empathy increases, so does the tendency to use an Accommodating style. This correlation is statistically significant with a p-value of 0. Finally, the Compromising style has a weak positive correlation (0.1435), indicating that as Empathy increases, there is a slight tendency to use a Compromising style. This correlation is also statistically significant. Based on the results of the Pearson correlation analysis presented in the table, we can determine which hypotheses are accepted and which ones are rejected.

In a study by Baron and Byrne, (1991) investigated the relationship between empathy and different conflict management styles. The researchers found that there was a significant positive relationship between empathy and collaborating conflict management style, but no significant relationship between empathy and competing conflict management style. In a study by Thomas (1976) investigated the relationship between empathy and various conflict management styles, including compromising, avoiding, and accommodating. The researcher found that there was a significant positive relationship between empathy and compromising conflict management style, a negative relationship between empathy and avoiding conflict management style, and a moderate positive relationship between empathy and accommodating conflict management style. The findings of this study add to the existing literature on empathy's function in conflict resolution and have important practical implications for people and groups working to perfect their own conflict management and resolution techniques.

Future research may use longitudinal investigations, include additional tests, consider confounding factors, conduct cross-cultural comparisons, use experimental designs to establish causation, and apply these suggestions to advance conflict management and interpersonal relationships.

6.1. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY:

The possibility for creating treatments or training programmes to improve empathy and advance practical conflict resolution techniques is one of the study's potential future implications.

1. **Individual and Relationship Development:** Being conscious of one's conflict resolution preferences requires an understanding of the connection between fighting words and empathy. Improving empathy can lead to better dispute resolution and happier relationships.

2. **Conflict Resolution Training:** The results can guide the creation of educational initiatives that advance empathy abilities and encourage healthy modes of conflict resolution. Such initiatives are advantageous to people in social, professional, and private spheres.

3. **Gender, Culture, and Conflict Resolution:** The need of taking gender and cultural considerations into account when resolving conflicts is highlighted by differences in conflict management approaches between genders. The impact of culture on conflict resolution and the function of empathy may be further investigated.

4. **Organisational conflict management:** Businesses may use tactics that foster empathy and encourage flexible dispute resolution techniques. This may result in better team dynamics, fewer disagreements, and more worker wellbeing.

5. **Additional Study Needed to Understand Avoiding Style:** Additional study is required to fully comprehend the shaky positive link between empathy and the avoiding style. Investigating the root causes can help direct the creation of solutions that address avoidance tendencies and advance beneficial conflict management techniques.

6.2. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

Data from participants may have been subject to social desirability bias since they were asked to report only positive characteristics. People may respond with what they think others want to hear rather than sharing their genuine thoughts and experiences, which might skew the findings.

Because of potential sample error, the findings may not be generalizable. The results of the research might be off if the sample population isn't representative of the general population or other groups of individuals. The study's time constraints may prevent thorough data collection and analysis, perhaps yielding unreliable findings.

Furthermore, the study only considered a limited number of factors that may impact academic achievement, such as empathy, conflict management and did not consider other potential factors such as socioeconomic status or cultural background. Future studies may benefit from exploring a broader range of factors that may impact academic achievement.

REFERENCES

Abdelshahid, A. (2019). The Relationship between Empathy and Conflict Management Styles among University Students. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(1), 29-39.

Ahmed, A., & Mahroof, R. M. (2017). Exploring the Role of Emotional Intelligence and Empathy in Conflict Management. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(22), 44-53.

Alam, S. S., Yusuf, S., & Razak, D. A. (2017). Emotional Intelligence, Conflict Management Styles and Job Performance: A Study of Front-line Hotel Employees. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 16(3), 300-315.

Alghamdi, R., & Alasmari, A. (2021). The Relationship between Empathy and Conflict Management Styles among Saudi Students at a Private University. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 15(1), 312-323.

Alkatheri, S. M., Alqahtani, A. A., & Aldosari, N. M. (2019). The Relationship between Empathy and Conflict Management Styles among Dental Students at a Saudi Arabian University. *Saudi Dental Journal*, 31(4), 435-440.

Alvarez, M. J., & Zarate, M. A. (2001). Conflict resolution styles in Spain, Mexico, and Peru. *International Journal of Psychology*, 36(2), 86-93.

Aslam, H. D., & Raja, U. (2019). The Mediating Role of Empathy in the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Management Styles. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(2), 130-144.

Bao, Y., Lin, L., & Hou, L. (2020). Relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Empathy, and Conflict Management Styles among Chinese Hospital Nurses. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 7(1), 61-65.

Barta, J., & Shortall, J. (2017). Conflict Management Styles and Empathy: Examining the Relationship in the Context of Workplace Interactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47(3), 123-130.

Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (1991). *Social psychology: Understanding human interaction* (5th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (2000). *Social Psychology: Understanding Human Interaction* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Behfar, K. J., Peterson, R. S., Mannix, E. A., & Trochim, W. M. (2008). The critical role of conflict resolution in teams: A close look at the links between conflict type, conflict management strategies, and team outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 170-188.

Bhatia, V. (2019). Empathy and Conflict Management Styles in Relation to Sociomoral Reasoning among College Students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(3), 107-121.

Chiu, R. K., & Kwan, L. Y. (2010). Assessing the Effect of Leader Emotional Intelligence on Task Conflict and Relationship Conflict in Groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 467-481.

Cenkci, T., & Yıldırım, İ. (2021). The Mediating Role of Empathy on the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Management Styles of High School Principals. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 9(2), 178-192.

Dagli, G. (2017). The Effect of Communication Skills and Empathy on Conflict Management Styles of Nurses: A Study on Turkish Nurses. *Journal of Health Management*, 19(3), 317-327.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113-126.

De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 741–749.

Dempsey, R. M., Sanders, G. L., & McClellan, L. R. (2010). Conflict Management Styles and Empathy: An Examination of the Relationship between Two Competing Variables. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 7(2), 23-36.

Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 461-488.

Fink, A. (2017). *Conducting research literature reviews: From the Internet to paper*. Sage Publications.

Fink, E. L., & Bray, S. R. (2017). The effect of communication on conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 34(3), 361-380.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50.

Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). Thriving through Relationships. In S. Joseph (Ed.), *Positive Psychology in Practice* (2nd ed., pp. 311-327). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Hocker, J. L., & Wilmot, W. W. (2014). *Interpersonal conflict* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ismail, M. A., & Awaad, A. (2017). The Relationship between Empathy and Conflict Management Styles among University Students in Egypt. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 6(2), 135-153.

Janssen, O., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2004). Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 368–384.

Jaramillo, F., & Mulki, J. P. (2008). The Role of Empathy in Customer-employee Interactions and Sales Performance: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(7), 698-705.

Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Development and validation of the Basic Empathy Scale. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29(4), 589-611.

Jones, K. S. (2006). The impact of emotional intelligence on conflict resolution in project management. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 132(5), 489-494.

Osman, S. (2016). Investigating the relationship between fighting languages and empathy. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(3), 567-582.

Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(3), 206-235.

Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 889-935). Rand McNally.

Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. H. (1974). Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 889-935.

Thomas, K. W., & Schmidt, W. H. (1976). A survey of managerial interests with respect to conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19(2), 315-318.

APPENDIX

Consent: I confirm that I have read and understood the above information completely and I willingly want to participate in this study.

I agree

Name

_____

Email

_____

Gender

_____

Educational Qualification

_____

Employment Status

_____

Marital Status

_____

Section A

Instructions: Kindly go through each item with five alternatives and tick the most appropriate one only.

Please SELECT ONE response that best describes you. Be honest, there are no right or wrong answers!

Assign your answers the following numbers from questions 1-15

Rarely 1

Sometimes 2

Often 3

Always 4

1. I discuss issues with others to try to find solutions that meet everyone's needs.   1234

2. I try to negotiate and use a give-and-take approach to problem situations. 1234

3. I try to meet the expectations of others.   1234

4. I would argue my case and insist on the advantages of my point of view.   1234

5. When there is a disagreement, I gather as much information as I can and keep the lines of communication open.   1234

6. When I find myself in an argument, I usually say very little and try to leave as soon as possible. 1234

7. I try to see conflicts from both sides. What do I need? What does the other person need? What are the issues involved? 1234

8. I prefer to compromise when solving problems and just move on. 1234

9. I find conflicts exhilarating; I enjoy the battle of wits that usually follows. 1234

10. Being in a disagreement with other people makes me feel uncomfortable and anxious.1234

11. I try to meet the wishes of my friends and family. 1234

12. I can figure out what needs to be done and I am usually right. 1234

13. To break deadlocks, I would meet people halfway. 1234

14. I may not get what I want but it's a small price to pay for keeping the peace. 1234

15. I avoid hard feelings by keeping my disagreements with others to myself.

Section B

Below is a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and rate how frequently you feel or act in the manner described. Select your answer on the response form. There are no right or wrong answers or trick questions. Please answer each question as honestly as you can.

Never = 0;

Rarely = 1;

Sometimes = 2;

Often = 3;

Always = 4

1. When someone else is feeling excited, I tend to get excited too 0 1 2 3 4

2. Other people's misfortunes do not disturb me a great deal 0 1 2 3 4

3. It upsets me to see someone being treated disrespectfully 0 1 2 3 4

4. I remain unaffected when someone close to me is happy 0 1 2 3 4

5. I enjoy making other people feel better 0 1 2 3 4

6. I have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me 0 1 2 3 4

7. When a friend starts to talk about his\her problems, I try to steer the conversation towards something else 0 1 2 3 4

8. I can tell when others are sad even when they do not say anything 0 1 2 3 4

9. I find that I am "in tune" with other people's moods 0 1 2 3 4

10. I do not feel sympathy for people who cause their own serious illnesses 0 1 2 3 4

11. I become irritated when someone cries 0 1 2 3 4

12. I am not really interested in how other people feel 0 1 2 3 4

13. I get a strong urge to help when I see someone who is upset 0 1 2 3 4

14. When I see someone treated unfairly, I do not feel very much pity for them 0 1 2 3 4

15. I find it silly for people to cry out of happiness 0 1 2 3 4

16. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards him\her