

# A Study on Factors Contributing for Adverse Effect on Humanity and Tactics for the Fight for More Compassionate Humanity

Dr. Parthasaradhy. T<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Haridas. P.K<sup>2</sup>, Mr. Subramanian. V<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Professor, Department of Management studies, Sri Venkateshwaraa College of Engineering and Technology, Puducherry*

<sup>2</sup>*Associate Professor, Department of Management studies, Sri Venkateshwaraa College of Engineering and Technology, Puducherry*

<sup>3</sup>*Assistant Professor, Department of Management studies, Sri Venkateshwaraa College of Engineering and Technology, Puducherry*

**Abstract-** What makes us human is our humanity, including our ability to love and care for others. There is a widespread imagination of future potential on humanity, because human conduct is complex, multifaceted, and varied. The future of humanity is probably going to be less confrontational, more amicable, and happier, but it might not be particularly exciting. Several factors are interconnected causing current and future humanity like environmental degradation, climate change, cross cultural conflicts including gender, communal and regional disparities which are to be taken in to account for investigating human enhancement and redefining the human condition, kindness and understanding are qualities that must be improved. Finding variables that negatively impact humanity and choosing combative strategies to promote loving humanity are the main goals of this empirical investigation.

**Keywords -** Humanity, Influencing factors, Future humanity, Strategies, Compassionate humanity

## INTRODUCTION

In an era marked by unprecedented technological advancement, economic growth, and global connectivity, humanity paradoxically continues to grapple with a host of adverse challenges that threaten the well-being of individuals and societies alike. From systemic inequality, conflict, and environmental degradation to social polarization, mental health crises, and erosion of empathy, the cumulative impact of these factors is reshaping the fabric of human coexistence. Understanding the root causes of these adverse effects on humanity is not only an intellectual endeavour but a moral imperative.

This study seeks to empirically examine the multifaceted factors that contribute to negative societal and psychological outcomes, ranging from structural injustices to cultural and behavioral patterns. By drawing on interdisciplinary data sources, spanning sociology, psychology, economics, and environmental science, this research aims to offer a holistic view of the forces undermining human dignity, equity, and compassion.

Moreover, the study explores viable tactics and interventions aimed at cultivating a more compassionate global society. These include grassroots activism, educational reform, inclusive policy-making, community-based healing, and innovations in technology for social good. Through a critical analysis of both empirical data and case studies, this research aspires to bridge the gap between understanding and action.

Ultimately, this study endeavours not only to highlight the urgent challenges facing humanity but also to contribute to the growing body of knowledge and practice dedicated to fostering resilience, empathy, and sustainable peace in an increasingly complex world.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

People seek frequent, affectively positive interactions within the context of long-term, caring relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Some people experience acute distress from which they are unable to recover (Bonanno, 2004). It has been argued that moral progress involves expanding our concern from the family to humanity as a whole (Decety & Cowell, 2014). The role of emotion in

moral action, especially altruistic behavior, has been a topic of philosophical debate for centuries (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987). As the positive psychology movement inspires additional research on positive emotions, (Fredrickson, 2001), As humans we are a highly social species (Singer & Klimecki, 2014)

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Society has encountered more and more social, political, economic, and environmental problems in recent decades, which have had a negative impact on both individual well-being and the advancement of society as a whole. Rising inequality, structural unfairness, war, discrimination, environmental degradation, and the weakening of empathy and community ties are some of these issues. Globally, cultures are nevertheless becoming more divided, hostile, and insensitive to suffering in spite of scientific and technical breakthroughs.

The underlying reasons of these detrimental trends are intricate and multidimensional, encompassing both personal and systemic elements. But there is still a significant knowledge vacuum on the ways in which these contributing factors interact and the practical tactics that may be used to foster a society that is more humane, egalitarian, and compassionate. Without this knowledge, attempts to lessen damage and promote human dignity run the risk of becoming disjointed or ineffectual.

In addition to examining useful, empirically supported strategies that people, groups, and organizations can use to foster a compassionate culture, this study aims to pinpoint and evaluate the main causes of the negative impacts on humanity. By filling this knowledge vacuum, the study hopes to lay the groundwork for wise decisions that might promote a more equitable and compassionate world community.

#### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To determine and examine the main causes of the negative impacts on humanity.
2. To investigate and suggest practical methods and techniques that can advance a more sympathetic human race.

#### RESEARCH GAP

Although many studies have looked at particular global issues like poverty, violence, prejudice, and climate change, the research that is now available

frequently treats these problems separately and concentrates more on their immediate effects than on their interrelated underlying causes. Furthermore, despite the fact that empathy and compassion are commonly debated in philosophical, psychological, and religious contexts, thorough, multidisciplinary research that connects the loss in compassion to larger societal trends and systemic problems is lacking.

The identification of workable, scalable, and culturally sensitive tactics that may be applied at many levels—individual, communal, and institutional—to promote a more compassionate humanity is also severely lacking. Current strategies for fostering compassion are frequently theoretical or restricted to small-scale initiatives, with little assessment of their long-term efficacy or wider use. By incorporating a multifaceted explanation of the causes of human suffering and offering comprehensive, doable strategies to advance empathy, solidarity, and humane values in modern society, this study fills these gaps.

#### METHODOLOGY

##### Research Design

In order to investigate the research problem, the study uses an empirical research design that gathers and examines primary data. This design makes it possible to gather data directly from sources and analyze it using quantitative methods to produce insightful findings.

##### Sample Size and Sampling Method

In this study fifty respondents made up the sample size. Because of time, accessibility, and resource limitations, a convenience sampling approach was used. It was a non-probability sampling technique since participants were chosen depending on their availability and desire to participate.

##### Data Collection Method

A personal survey was used to gather data. In order to collect pertinent data pertaining to the study's goals, a structured questionnaire comprising both closed-ended and a few open-ended questions was created. In order to increase response accuracy and address any questions immediately, the surveys were given out in person.

##### Data Analysis

The percentage analysis approach was used to examine the gathered data. The proportion of respondents for each response type had to be

determined. A clear, straightforward, and comparable comprehension of the data was made possible by the application of percentage analysis.

#### Ethical Considerations

Study participation was completely optional, before any data was collected, respondents were made aware of the goal of the study and their agreement was sought. Throughout the study, confidentiality and anonymity were upheld.

Table-1: Respondents opinion on factors showing an adverse effect on humanity.

Factors showing an adverse effect on humanity.											
S.No.	Factors	Strongly Agree	%	Agree	%	Neutral	%	Disagree	%	Strongly Disagree	%
1	Environmental degradation	45	90	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Gender and communal discrimination	35	70	2	4	6	12	4	8	1	2
3	Climate change	11	22	7	14	10	20	8	16	2	4
4	Social isolation	48	96	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	2
5	Technological advancement and its risk	40	80	4	8	2	4	4	8	2	4
6	Nuclear families	22	44	9	18	12	24	4	8	25	50
7	Conflicts and violence	25	50	10	20	5	10	6	12	15	30
8	Greater cultural disorder	14	28	12	24	10	20	8	16	0	0
9	Regional disparities	2	4	3	6	10	20	20	40	4	8
10	Intolerance	5	10	8	16	15	30	20	40	25	50

#### Interpretation:

The information shows that many people are worried about a number of issues that are thought to have a negative impact on humanity. The most universally acknowledged threats are social isolation (96% strongly agree) and environmental degradation (90% strongly agree), suggesting a high level of understanding of issues pertaining to psychological and environmental well-being. Many people also view technological advancement critically (80% strongly agree), which emphasizes widespread fear about the risks associated with rapid innovation.

Significant concern is also expressed about gender and communal discrimination (70% strongly agree), demonstrating a persistent awareness of social justice issues. On the other hand, variables such as

intolerance and geographical inequality have significantly lower agreement percentages, indicating a less united or split public opinion on their negative influence. Similarly, the public's perspective of climate change is unexpectedly split (only 22% strongly agree), which may be a sign of desensitization or a lack of urgency.

With a wide range of answers, the perception of nuclear families and cultural disorder seems complicated and inconsistent, indicating varying values or understandings among the populace. Although some people perceive conflicts and violence (50% strongly agree), a sizable percentage disagree (30% strongly disagree), which again suggests that different people have different ideas about what poses a serious threat.

Table-2: Respondents opinion on strategies for battling to create more compassionate humanity

Strategies for battling to create more compassionate humanity											
S.No.	Influencing elements	Strongly Agree	%	Agree	%	Neutral	%	Disagree	%	Strongly Disagree	%
1	Environmental protection	50	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Bring gender and communal equality	40	80	3	6	2	4	4	8	1	2
3	Combating climate change	38	76	5	10	4	8	1	2	2	4
4	Overcoming Social isolation	42	84	3	6	2	4	2	4	1	2

5	Regulating technological advancement	45	90	2	4	1	2	0	0	2	4
6	Educating emotional intelligence	5	10	1	2	2	4	17	34	25	50
7	Developing shared living policies	6	12	8	16	9	18	12	24	15	30
8	Establishing sound conflict resolution framework	29	58	12	24	5	10	4	8		0
9	Establishing cultural standards	20	40	15	30	5	10	6	12	4	8
10	Eliminate regional disparities	5	10	3	6	2	4	15	30	25	50

#### Interpretation:

Environmental protection is the policy that is most widely supported, with 100% of respondents strongly agreeing that it is important. Overcoming social isolation (84% strongly agree), limiting technological growth (90% strongly agree), and promoting gender and communal equality (80% strongly agree) are additional highly approved initiatives. These results demonstrate the public's strong desire for structural changes that advance social cohesion, justice, and well-being, 76% of respondents strongly think that combating climate change is crucial, demonstrating the growing convergence of compassion-driven action and environmental understanding.

Some tactics, meanwhile, exhibit a great deal of disagreement or lack of support. Notably, there is a great deal of pessimism regarding the removal of regional inequities and the teaching of emotional intelligence (50% strongly disagree). In a similar vein, 54% of respondents dislike or strongly disagree with the creation of shared living policies. These findings imply that cultural or personal values may clash with group or policy-based solutions, particularly when they have an impact on people's perceived liberties or way of life. A readiness to take into account organized methods to peace and cooperation is seen by the moderate but favorable support given to strategies like creating strong frameworks for dispute resolution and defining cultural norms.

#### FINDINGS

Top concerns: Social isolation and environmental degradation are universally detrimental. Strong concern: Although there is considerable skepticism, gender discrimination and technical hazards are widely recognized. Divergent perspectives: Opinions on climate change, conflict,

cultural disorder, and nuclear families are more divided, which may be a reflection of complexity or different societal and personal settings.

Low perceived impact: There is a lot of debate over regional disparities and intolerance, which suggests that many respondents may not see them as direct negative causes or may view them as complicated issues need more research.

There is broad agreement that fostering a compassionate society requires addressing issues including social isolation, egalitarianism, climate change, environmental protection, and technology regulation. Cultural norms and conflict resolution have a moderate level of support, although they might require more awareness or clear frameworks to increase acceptability. Unexpectedly, there was a high level of disagreement and little support for shared living principles and emotional intelligence education, suggesting potential misunderstandings or lack of acceptance. Significant skepticism surrounds efforts to eradicate regional inequities, indicating problems with perception or viability.

#### CONCLUSION

Broadly acknowledged problems like social isolation and environmental degradation need immediate attention and also launch awareness campaigns. Communicate clearly when discussing technical dangers in order to allay anxieties and encourage responsible development. Encourage discussion about gender discrimination and disputes in order to create agreement and workable policies. Investigate the divisive opinions on nuclear families and geographical differences using more in-depth qualitative research to uncover the fundamental causes to promote greater empathy, educate and increase awareness of lesser-known problems like intolerance.

Leverage public consensus by concentrating message and policy on topics that are widely supported, such as equality and environmental protection. Raise awareness and educate others about shared living and emotional intelligence, maybe elaborating on how these practices foster compassion over time. Showcase workable solutions and emphasize achievements to allay worries about the eradication of regional disparities. Provide cultural frameworks and explicit dispute resolution procedures that are inclusive and flexible enough to accommodate a range of demographics.

#### REFERENCE

- [1] Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- [2] Bonanno, G. A. (2004). Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.59.1.20>
- [3] Decety, J., & Cowell, J. M. (2014). The complex relation between morality and empathy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(7), 337–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.04.008>
- [4] Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(1), 91–119. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.91>
- [5] Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.56.3.218>
- [6] Singer, T., & Klimecki, O. M. (2014). Empathy and compassion. *Current Biology*, 24(18), R875–R878. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2014.06.054>

#### List of tables

Table. No.	Title of the table	Page. No.
Table-1	Respondents opinion on factors showing an adverse effect on humanity.	3
Table-2	Respondents opinion on strategies for battling to create more compassionate humanity	4