MANAGING CONFLICTS AND BUILDING CONSENSUS

K.H. Ng[1]

[1] Department of Biomedical Imaging, Faculty of Medicine, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Abstract— **Conflict arises from disagreements and frustrations that are inevitable in all human interactions, including scientific and healthcare environments. If left unchecked, it may worsen and result in the deterioration of trust and personal relationships. However, when managed constructively, it can lead to personal growth, innovation and stronger collaborations. Therefore, this article discusses the major conflict management styles and methods to build consensus within research and clinical settings with the aim of developing interpersonal and leadership skills necessary for sustainable teamwork and ethical research. Early-career professionals can also relate themselves to some examples drawn from science and healthcare settings. The points and scenarios discussed will provide them with insight on how they could better handle their unique situations. As they gain maturity, it is hoped that their relationship skills will be equally nurtured to form meaningful bonds and solve relationship problems that arise in their own research teams.**

Keywords— **Conflict management, Consensus building, Emotional intelligence, Leadership, Professional development, Teamwork.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Scientific progress depends not only on technical excellence but also on the ability of individuals to work together effectively. Communication, collaboration and trust are the pillars of success in research and healthcare. Yet, conflicts are inevitable whenever people with different values, personalities, goals and cultural backgrounds come together.

For example, a young scientist may disagree with the views of his mentor and dismiss them as “dinosaurs”. On the other hand, the mentor believes he knows better because he has been consuming salt (as the Chinese metaphor goes) even before junior could pick up his first test tube. So, how do we reconcile such differences so that the young and veteran scientists can synergize their ideas, experience, creativity and innovation to produce great exploits?

Conflict should not be viewed as a failure. Instead, it should be treated as a precursor in efforts to understand and empathize with other people. When handled wisely, it becomes a source of creativity and problem-solving. As Mahatma Gandhi once said, “Leadership at one time meant muscles, but today it means getting along with people.”

For early-career scientists, mastering conflict resolution is as critical as mastering scientific methodology. It is the first step that youngsters must learn before they move on to prestigious institutions or even running their own research teams, where work pressure and disagreements are more severe.

Conflicts will never end, and therefore, it is vital to draw insights to resolve them in as many ways as possible. They are more like life lessons that we must pay attention to, as we cannot expect anything better to come out from working in our own silos.

The causes of conflicts and the various styles to manage them, particularly in communication. Communication is key to resolving conflicts because a good communicator can convey his/her ideas and convince others to give it a chance to work. Communicating also requires empathy, which indicates that research is not only driven by science and hard data, but also the art of relationship in understanding each other’s attitude, stance and life goals.

Conflict should not be viewed as a failure. Instead, it should be treated as a precursor in efforts to understand and empathize with other people.

II. ROOTS OF CONFLICT

Conflicts usually arise from miscommunication, which has been linked to serious workplace problems, including medical errors, strained relationships and reduced efficiency [2]. Common sources of conflict include:

- Clashing personalities or values – differences in working style, temperament or culture. Sometimes ego may also come in the way;
- Ambiguous expectations – unclear responsibilities or poorly defined goals;
- Competition for resources – such as funding, space or specialized equipment; and
- Perceived inequity – for example, in authorship recognition or workload distribution.

In scientific teams, these tensions frequently manifest as disputes over authorship, data ownership, intellectual property or ethics. Recognizing that such conflicts are normal and can be managed constructively is the first step towards resolution.

Conflicts usually arise from miscommunication, which has been linked to serious workplace problems, including medical errors, strained relationships and reduced efficiency.

III. MANAGEMENT STYLES

The Thomas–Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI) identifies five approaches to conflict management [3]. They are typical responses that humans display when working with each other in varying degrees of disagreement.

1. Avoidance – ignoring the issue or delaying discussion. It may temporarily defuse tension, but rarely resolves the underlying problem.

   Example: A junior researcher remains silent when a senior colleague takes credit for their work, hoping the issue will fade away.

2. Accommodation – yielding to maintain harmony. This approach may prevent escalation but can lead to resentment because members are just tolerating each other up to a certain limit.

   Example: A team member accepts an unfair task allocation to avoid confrontation.

3. Competition – pursuing one's own goals assertively, often at others' expense. Effective only in urgent or safety-critical situations.

   Example: A department head insists on using limited resources exclusively for his/her project.

4. Compromise – both sides give up something to reach an acceptable middle ground. While practical, it can dilute the best solution. This may require empathy to understand what the other side is going through and how much they are willing to cooperate.

   Example: Two researchers agree to alternate first authorship on related publications.

5. Collaboration – jointly developing a win–win solution. This is the most desirable strategy for sustainable teamwork.

   Example: A multidisciplinary team defines authorship criteria together and reviews them periodically.

Collaborative conflict resolution demands time, empathy and openness – but it strengthens trust and team cohesion, particularly in healthcare environments where interdependence is high [4].

IV. COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Effective conflict management begins with good communication. Active listening, empathy, and clarity are essential [5]. Active listening involves full attention, paraphrasing to confirm understanding and avoiding premature judgment. Empathy, derived from the Greek *en pathos* (to feel within), helps team members to understand each other's viewpoints. It enhances teamwork and patient-centred care in healthcare professions [6].

Practical strategies for conflict resolution include:

- Clarify your objectives before discussions.
- Focus on issues, not personalities.
- Use "I" statements ("I feel concerned about...") rather than blaming language.
- Choose an appropriate time and neutral setting for difficult conversations.
- Acknowledge emotions respectfully ("I can see this matter means a lot to you").
- Seek shared goals ("What do all of us want to achieve?").

These interpersonal competencies, often termed "soft skills", are as critical as technical proficiency. Such abilities are helpful to shape our career advancement and research success.

V. BUILDING CONSENSUS

Consensus (from the Latin word *con-sentire* or to feel together) goes beyond compromising or gaining a majority vote. It is a process of collective decision-making that integrates all perspectives and achieves broad support, even if unanimity is not possible [7]. Consensus-building is vital in healthcare and research teams, where physicians, physicists, engineers and administrators must align their decisions.

It ensures that there is collective ownership of outcomes, thus reducing resistance in decision-making and improving the quality of outcomes [8].

One example of a decision-making process is the Delphi method, which was initially developed by the Rand Corporation (a United States think tank) in the 1950s to forecast the effects of technology on warfare. Today, it has become a structured tool for achieving expert consensus in various fields, such as healthcare, education and corporate management [9].

In summary, the process involves several rounds of questionnaire-based feedback and discussions within groups of experts. The process includes:

a) Defining the problem clearly;
b) Selecting an appropriate expert panel;
c) Conducting an initial questionnaire survey;
d) Sharing anonymous feedback and iterating
e) through multiple rounds; and,
f) Consolidating results into a final report.

The method is especially useful in scientific collaborations where hierarchy may inhibit open discussions. For example, in authorship disputes, young or low-rank academics may find it difficult to convey their views in credit-sharing.

In large projects, many researchers involved may interpret the data differently, and these views have to be analyzed to identify a common point.

In terms of resource-sharing and policy-making, the Delphi method can identify and produce ideas and proposals that are well accepted by most researchers, even at the highest level of the field.

For example, a national medical physics association once sought to develop consensus guidelines for the safe implementation of artificial intelligence (AI) tools in diagnostic imaging. To achieve this, the Delphi method was applied by the steering committee.

In the first round, 25 experts, including clinical physicists, radiologists, computer scientists, and ethicists, were asked to identify key areas of concern, such as data privacy, algorithm validation and accountability. Their responses were anonymized and summarized.

In the second round, participants reviewed the summary and rated the importance of each issue on a Likert scale. After three iterative rounds, convergence was achieved: the panel agreed on 10 core principles and a framework for local adoption. The final consensus statement was published as a guideline endorsed by the national body.

This example illustrates how the Delphi method promotes equitable participation by ensuring that every expert's voice is heard and taken into consideration, regardless of seniority or institutional affiliation. The anonymity of responses minimizes peer pressure, while structured feedback refines collective understanding and supports evidence-based policy formation.

The drawback of this method is its time-consuming discussions and it may be less effective in emotionally charged conflicts that require face-to-face dialogue and trust-building measures to resolve [9].

Consensus-building ensures that there is collective ownership of outcomes, besides reducing resistance in decision-making and improving the quality of outcomes.

Although consensus-building involves the gathering of feedback from all researchers to come to a point of agreement, it is also important to know what it does not entail to avoid reaching a "false conclusion". Consensus-building is NOT:

i) A vote of majority or unanimity. Ideas should not be implemented just because everybody in the team is "going with the flow". The point of discussions is to ensure that ideas have been thoroughly debated, making them feasible with common objectives.

ii) To eliminate conflict. Conflicts will always arise one after the other. They have to be resolved with tangible solutions generated by the research group.

iii) A guarantee of truth or permanent state. All ideas and proposals are not infallible and carry the risk of error. This is where responsibility is shared among all members for self-improvement.

iv) A contest or power struggle. Researchers facing this situation should ask themselves why they are even trying to obtain a consensus in the first place.

VI. CASE STUDIES

Case 1: Authorship dispute

A junior scientist performs most of the experimental work, but the principal investigator (PI) insists on first authorship. After mediation, the team applies collaborative principles and agrees on transparent authorship criteria. The junior researcher is listed as the first author, while the PI is recognized for supervision. This restores morale and sets a fair precedent.

Case 2: Resource allocation

Two research groups compete for access to a shared imaging system. A structured meeting with an impartial facilitator leads to a schedule balancing fairness and project urgency. Written policies ensure transparency and reduce future friction.

Case 3: Ethical dilemma

A young researcher is pressured to "adjust" outlier data to align results with expectations. The matter is referred to the institutional ethics committee, reaffirming integrity as a non-negotiable value. Constructive dialogue safeguards both the whistleblower and the supervisor from reputational harm.

These cases demonstrate that conflict, when approached ethically and collaboratively, can lead to institutional improvements and enhanced mutual respect [4].

VII. EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Effective conflict resolution requires emotional intelligence (EI) — the capacity to recognize, understand and manage emotions in oneself and others [10]. Leaders with high EI will often display these characteristics:

- Remaining calm under stress;
- Showing empathy without losing objectivity;
- Inspiring trust and cooperation; and
- Turning disagreements into opportunities for growth.

In interdisciplinary healthcare teams, emotionally intelligent leadership transforms potential conflicts into collaborations, besides promoting innovation and better patient outcomes [11]. Hence, EI is closely related to leadership capability. A person who wants to lead effectively must know what it feels like to be led, which begins as a good follower or team player.

VIII. TIPS FOR EARLY CAREER SCIENTISTS

Attitude and conflict-handling skills can make or break the career of young scientists. Unfortunately, there is no shortcut to learning but to observe, evaluate and learn from errors. But those should not stop us from sharpening our skills in conflict resolution. People with such ability are often highly regarded and well-respected.

For those who are just beginning their careers in the corporate world or academia, it is good to know that:

1. Conflict is natural and sometimes constructive;
2. Issues should be resolved early because silence allows resentment to grow;
3. It is vital to understand your default conflict style;
4. There is no shame in seeking mentorship for complex interpersonal situations;
5. Taking effort to record agreements in writing and define each other's role early in a project may prevent future disputes;
6. Ensuring transparency in authorship, data use and resource allocation will facilitate collaborations; and,
7. Cultivating empathy and gratitude can foster resilience and collegiality, perhaps even win more friends and allies to face an ever-demanding working environment.

Mastering these interpersonal skills will distinguish capable researchers and effective scientific leaders from the rest.

IX. CONCLUSION AND REFLECTION

Conflict management is not about avoiding disagreements but transforming them into collaborations. For healthcare scientists, influence stems not from authority but from empathy, clarity and fairness.

As John Maxwell noted, *"Leadership is influence — nothing more, nothing less"*. When handled with respect and openness, conflict becomes a bridge rather than a barrier, linking diverse perspectives toward a shared mission and advancing science for the good of humanity.

As scientists and healthcare professionals, we often dedicate our energy to perfecting technical skills such as mastering instruments, analyzing data and publishing results. Yet, it is our ability to listen, empathize and work through disagreements that determines the quality and impact of our contributions.

Conflict management and consensus-building are not merely administrative or interpersonal tasks; they are ethical responsibilities. How we communicate in moments of tension reflects our respect for colleagues, for truth and for the scientific community itself. Every disagreement is an invitation to grow in humility, patience and wisdom.

For early-career scientists, embracing these "human dimensions" of science will not only enhance teamwork but also nurture integrity and resilience. By learning to turn conflict into collaboration, we create a culture of trust and innovation.

By learning to turn conflict into collaboration, we create a culture of trust and innovation.

REFERENCES

1. Shannon, C.E., & Weaver, W. (1949). *The Mathematical Theory of Communication.* University of Illinois Press.
2. Leonard, M., Graham, S., & Bonacum, D. (2004). The human factor: The critical importance of effective teamwork and communication in providing safe care. *Quality and Safety in Health Care,* 13 (Suppl 1), i85–i90. https://doi.org/10.1136/qhc.13.suppl_1.i85
3. Thomas, K.W., & Kilmann, R.H. (1974). *Thomas–Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument.* CPP, Inc.
4. Ronquillo, C., Ellis V.L., Toney-Butleret, T.J. (2017). Conflict Management. StatPearls Publishing.
5. Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-Centred Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications and Theory* Houghton Mifflin.
6. Hojat, M. (2016). *Empathy in Health Professions Education and Patient Care.* Springer.
7. Sun Tzu. (2000). *The Art of War.* Allandale Online Publishing, England.
8. Rahim, M.A. (2011). *Managing Conflict in Organizations.* Transaction Publishers.
9. Dalkey, N., & Helmer, O. (1963). An Experimental Application of the Delphi Method to the Use of Experts. *Management Science,* 9(3), 458–467. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.9.3.458
10. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ.* Bantam Books.
11. Humphrey, R.H. (2013). *Effective Leadership: Theory, Cases, and Applications.* Sage Publications.

Contacts of the corresponding author:

Author:	Kwan Hoong Ng
Institute:	Universiti Malaya
Street:	Lembah Pantai
City:	Kuala Lumpur
Country:	Malaysia
Email:	kwanhoong.ng@gmail.com